EIGHTH PROGRESS REPORT ON THE COMPENSATED WORK THERAPY (CWT) / VETERANS INDUSTRIES (VI) PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR 2004

Sandra G. Resnick, Ph.D. Associate Director

Sharon Medak Associate Project Director

Rick Baldino Program Analyst

Linda Corwel Program Analyst

Robert Rosenheck, MD Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program is a therapeutic work-for-pay program authorized in 1976 by Public Law 94-581. The major goals of the program are: 1) to use remunerative work to maximize a veteran's level of functioning; 2) to prepare veterans for successful re-entry into the community as productive citizens, and; 3) to provide a structured daily activity to those veterans with severe and chronic disabling physical and/or mental conditions. The program has grown substantially over the years from 76 programs in FY 1994 to 106 programs in FY 2004. During FY 2004, 13,909 veterans participated in the program, earning a total of $38.7 million dollars.

This report, the eighth in a series, offers information for program managers at the national level, VISN level and the local program level.

During FY 2004, veterans entering the CWT/VI Program averaged 47.6 years of age and 4.2% were female. Half of the veterans were African American (49.9%), 4.9% were Hispanic, 2.5% were of other ethnic backgrounds, and 42.7% were White. Only 8.2% were married; 63.3% were separated, widowed or divorced, and 28.5% had never married. Approximately 93% had completed 12 years of education, and 40.2% completed at least some college. Although 41.9% of veterans reported that their usual employment pattern in the past three years was full-time competitive employment, nine out of ten veterans (91.3%) reported not working at all in the month prior to admission. Veterans entering the CWT/VI program have limited financial resources. Mean monthly incomes in the month prior to admission steadily dropped from $347 in FY 1993 to $208 in FY 2003 and rose slightly to $224 in FY 2004. Six out of ten veterans (63.8%) were homeless upon entry to CWT/VI. Substance abuse is highly prevalent in this population – at admission, 86.6% of veterans were diagnosed with an alcohol problem and/or a drug problem and over half (57.8%) reported to have lost at least one job in the past due to their substance use. The proportion of veterans diagnosed with a serious mental illness or with a dual diagnosis (both a substance abuse disorder and a serious mental illness) is at its highest point since FY 1993: 51 2% of admitted veterans received a diagnosis of a serious mental illness, and 42.1% of veterans were dually diagnosed.

Veterans discharged during FY 2004 worked an average of 26.5 hours per week in CWT/VI and had an average hourly wage of $5.96. The proportion of veterans who had any Transitional Work Experience while in CWT/VI has more than doubled from FY 1993 (30.1%) to FY 2004 (81.9%). In FY 2004, workshop experiences were less common, with only 31.5% working in a workshop at least once. The majority of placements (both TWE and workshop) are on VA grounds.

Upon completion of their participation, four out of ten veterans had obtained competitive employment (full- or part-time). An additional 5.5% had arrangements at the time of discharge to be in some type of constructive activity (e.g. VA's Incentive

Therapy, student, trainee or unpaid volunteer) and 11.1% were retired and/or disabled. Since FY 1993 there has been an increase in the percentage of veterans rated as improved in virtually all clinical areas (e.g. alcohol problems, drug problems, mental health problems and medical problems) and work performance areas (e.g. attendance and punctuality, acceptance of supervision, relationship with co-workers, productivity and quality of production), although these percentages are relatively unchanged from FY 2003.

Performance as measured by 13 critical monitors was used to compare the operation of individual sites and to identify performance outliers. The norm used to evaluate the performance of individual sites on each critical monitor was either the national program mean, or in the case of outcome measures, the national median. Outcome measures were risk adjusted for differences in baseline veteran characteristics that are related to the outcomes. Ten of the 95 programs for which data are presented were outliers on 6 or more of the 13 critical monitors.

Comprehensive workload data summaries for VA's entire Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service (PSR), using data from the outpatient care file in Austin, Texas, indicate that altogether 39,704 individual veterans received PSR services during FY 2004 and 22,865 of them (57.6%) received services from the either the CWT/VI or CWT/TR programs.

As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT/VI will continue to be an important element in fostering community adjustment and functional rehabilitation of veterans disabled by psychiatric or addictive disorders, particularly CWT transitional work placements that are community-based, and CWT Supported Employment, a vocational service recently added to the array of CWT services.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

A. The Compensated Work Therapy / Veterans Industries Program

The Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program is a therapeutic work-for-pay program in which private sector businesses, or Federal Agencies, contract with VA for work to be performed by veterans. Authorized in 1976 by Public Law 94-581, the major goals of the program are: 1) to use remunerative work to maximize a veteran's level of functioning; 2) to prepare veterans for successful re-entry into the community as productive citizens, and; 3) to provide a structured daily activity to those veterans with severe and chronic disabling physical and/or mental conditions (Fountaine & Howard, 1987).

The CWT/VI Program has grown substantially over the years from 76 programs in FY 1994 to 106 operating programs in FY 2004. During FY 2004, VA Central Office reported that 13,909 veterans had been served in the program and these veterans had earned a total of $38.7 million dollars through their participation in CWT/VI. As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT/VI continues to be an important element in veterans' overall rehabilitation treatment plan.

VA medical centers sponsoring CWT/VI programs have two basic types of work therapy models. The first and more popular is a transitional employment model called Transitional Work Experiences (TWE). TWE sites are primarily located in government settings, usually the local VA medical center, but may also be located in community businesses. Veterans participating in TWE placements receive direct supervision from the customer or contractor. CWT/VI clinicians visit the placement site regularly and provide additional supervision as needed. The second work therapy model is participation in workshop-based sheltered employment. Work performed in the workshop most often involves assembly, packaging, collating and/or fabrication, although some sites operate workshops in which veterans learn advanced skills such as woodworking. Veterans are either paid on a piece rate basis or receive an hourly wage. Although some CWT/VI program sites operate both work therapy models, recently TWEs have been more popular, probably because they more closely approximate supported employment which is considered to be an evidence-based practice (Bond, Becker, Drake, et al, 2003). Several of the more recently established CWT/VI programs only offer TWE placements without a workshop option.

B. Organization of the Veterans Health Administration

The Veterans Health Administration (VHA) is organized into 22 semi-autonomous Veterans Integrated Service Networks (VISNs)[1]. Each VISN is charged with

---

[1] During FY 2002, VISNs 13 and 14 dissolved and merged into one VISN, VISN 23.

developing cost-effective health care programs that are responsive both to the national mission of VA, and to local circumstances and trends in health care delivery. Although administered independently, the VISNs are also accountable through centralized monitoring of performance and health care outcomes. This report, the eighth in a series of performance reports, offers information for program managers at the national level, VISN level and the local program level.

C. Evaluation and Monitoring Efforts

Since 1993 the Northeast Program Evaluation Center (NEPEC) in West Haven, CT has monitored the CWT/VI Program. The goals of the monitoring are to 1) provide a description of the status and needs of veterans currently in CWT/VI, 2) assure program accountability, and 3) identify ways to refine or change the program, both nationally and/or at specific sites.

Tracking the ongoing performance of CWT/VI program is accomplished through collecting information on every veteran who participates in CWT/VI treatment. The Veteran Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (see Appendix A) is completed on every veteran admitted to the CWT/VI program. Implemented on June 1,1993 and revised in September, 2000, the form consists of two sections. The first section is completed on or as near to the day of admission to CWT/VI as possible. Based on information obtained in a face-to-face interview with the veteran, the CWT/VI clinician records veteran demographic and military service characteristics as well as residential, vocational and income status. At the end of the first section, clinicians record the avenue of entry into the CWT/VI program and the veteran's psychiatric and medical status. The second section is completed at the conclusion of CWT/VI treatment. The clinician records the veteran's length of participation, type of discharge, total earnings, hours worked, and the veteran's arrangements for employment and housing after discharge. In addition, CWT/VI clinicians record their impressions of clinical change (deteriorated, unchanged or improved) in six work performance areas and four clinical areas.

1. Data Used to Assess CWT/VI Program Performance

The performance of each CWT/VI program is assessed with three types of measures that reflect essential aspects of program operation:

> The **program monitoring compliance measure** assesses compliance of individual CWT/VI programs with the collection of monitoring data.
>
> **Descriptive measures** provide basic information on the characteristics of the veterans served by the program (e.g. age, marital status, race, etc) or what veterans do while in the program (e.g., hours worked, wages earned, etc.).

Outcome measures provide information about veterans' status upon discharge from the program.

Some descriptive and outcome measures are also considered to be *critical monitor measures.* These measures evaluate how successful programs are at meeting the goals and objectives of the CWT/VI Program as set forth by programmatic guidelines. Critical monitors are used to identify sites whose performance is substantially different from other sites.

2. Selection of Critical Monitors

Outlined below are three objectives that reflect the goals of the CWT/VI Program. For each objective, the associated critical monitors are noted. The critical monitors cover three principal areas: 1) veteran characteristics (the extent to which the CWT/VI Program reaches the seriously mentally ill veteran population); 2) program participation (i.e. type of discharge, hours worked, hourly wage); and 3) outcomes (i.e. employment arrangements at the time of discharge, percent clinically improved).

Objective 1: The CWT/VI Program serves veterans with psychological or physical disabilities, particularly the underserved disabled veteran population.

Critical monitor selected to assess this objective is:
- Percent of veterans with a serious mental illness

Objective 2: The CWT/VI Program provides psychosocial (or physical) rehabilitation through remunerative work to veterans in order to encourage the development of good work habits, emphasizing attendance, reliability, punctuality, productivity, craftsmanship, creativity, personal responsibilities and acceptance of supervision.

Critical monitors selected to assess this objective are:
- Percent of veterans who had a mutually agreed/planned discharge from CWT/VI
- Percent of veterans who failed to comply with CWT/VI program requirements
- Average hours worked per week
- Average hourly wage

Objective 3: The CWT/VI Program provides treatment directed towards increasing the veteran's chances for adjustment and reentry into the community, including returning to the workforce and, preventing deterioration of medical, psychiatric and substance abuse problems.

Critical monitors selected to assess this objective are:
- Average work improvement score
- Among veterans with alcohol problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with drug problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with mental health problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with medical problems, percent improved
- Percent competitively employed (part- or full-time) after discharge
- Percent unemployed after discharge
- Percent employment status unknown after discharge

3. Determining Outliers on Critical Monitors

Generally, the average (or median) of all CWT/VI sites is used as the norm for evaluating the performance of each individual site. On descriptive measures, those sites that are one standard deviation above or below the mean in the *undesirable* direction are considered outliers. Outcome measures are risk adjusted for baseline characteristics. Selection of these baseline characteristics differs depending on the outcome measure, but they include age, race, marital status, education, previous employment history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses, including serious psychiatric illnesses and substance abuse problems. Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the *undesirable* direction after adjusting for baseline measures are considered outliers.

The identification of a site as an outlier on a critical monitor is intended to inform the program director, medical center leadership, network leadership and VA Central Office that the site is divergent from other sites with respect to the critical monitor. Each site is asked to carefully consider the measures on which they are outliers. In some instances this information is used to take corrective action in order to align the site more closely with the mission and goals of the program. In other instances sites have been identified as outliers because of legitimate idiosyncrasies in the operation of the program, which do not warrant corrective action. **It must be emphasized that these monitors should not be considered, by themselves, to be indicators of the quality of care delivered at particular sites.** They can be used only to identify statistical outliers, the importance of which must be determined by further discussion.

4. Overview of the Monitoring Process

Forms are completed on each veteran discharged from the CWT/VI program and are submitted monthly to NEPEC by program sites. These data are aggregated and reported back to sites on a quarterly basis. Before this progress report was issued, preliminary tables were distributed to all CWT/VI program sites, and CWT/VI program coordinators and staff were asked to review all tables for errors. VA Central Office has also reviewed data presented in this report. Data have been corrected or amended where appropriate.

5. CWT/VI as A Component of the VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service

The CWT/VI Program is only one component of the larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service (PSR), a section of the Mental Health Strategic Health Group. Other programs within PSR include Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence (CWT/TR)[2], Incentive Therapy (IT)[3] and Vocational Assistance / Counseling.

Data corresponding to 9 stop codes from VA's outpatient care file in Austin Texas were also obtained: 574 (mental health - CWT), 532 (psychosocial rehab-individual; used in the CWT/TR program), 559 (psychosocial rehab-group; used in the CWT/TR program), 208 (rehab medicine – CWT), 573 (Incentive Therapy – group), 207 (rehab medicine – Incentive Therapy), 535 (mental health - vocational assistance), 575 (mental health – vocational assistance group) and 213 (rehab medicine – vocational assistance).

D. Organization of This Report

This report is divided into two sections. The first section examines changes in the program, over time, from FY 1993 when the monitoring first began through to FY 2004. In addition, data on critical monitors are presented by VISN, and finally, site data is presented on the descriptive characteristics of veterans admitted to the program, the extent to which veterans participated in the program and veteran outcomes at the time of discharge.

---

[2] The CWT/TR program is a work-based Psychosocial Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Program (PRRTP)
offering a 24-hour setting for veterans involved in CWT/VI. The program utilizes a residential community, peer and professional support, with a strong emphasis on increasing personal responsibility. Veterans contribute (using their CWT/VI earnings) to the cost of operating and maintaining the residences and are responsible for planning purchasing and preparing their own meals. For more information on the CWT/TR program see the Sixth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program, Resnick, Sieffert, Medak and Rosenheck, 2004).
[3] Incentive Therapy program provides pre-vocational activity combined with intensive case management. This program is designed for veterans requiring a long term highly structured pre-vocational environment.

The second section of this report contains three appendices. Appendix A contains a copy of the monitoring data collection form. Appendix B contains 37 data tables derived from the monitoring data collection system. And finally, Appendix C contains summary data of the psychosocial rehabilitation services received by veterans as documented by stop codes recorded in VA's outpatient treatment file in Austin, Texas during FY 2004.

CHAPTER II: THE CLINICAL OPERATION

A. National Performance

Tables 1 - 6 in Appendix B present summary national data on the number of veterans served for whom monitoring data were collected, veteran characteristics, program participation, and discharge outcomes for fiscal years 1993 - 2003. Highlighted below are key findings:

Number of Veterans Served

- During FY 2004, data were collected on 8,224 veterans discharged from the CWT/VI Program, which is 89.0% of all discharges reported to VA Central Office (Table 10).

Veteran Characteristics

The majority of veterans admitted to the CWT/VI Program are referred by either VA outpatient programs or domiciliary care programs (40% and 33% respectively; Table 2).

- During FY 2004, veterans in the CWT/VI Program averaged 47.6 years of age and 4.2% were female. Half of the veterans were African American (49.9%), 4.9% were Hispanic, 2.5% were of other ethnic backgrounds, and 42.7% were White. Only 8.2% were married; 63.3% were separated, widowed or divorced, and 28.5% had never married. Approximately 93% completed 12 years of education, and 40% completed at least some college (Table 2).

- Veterans admitted to the CWT/VI continued to have limited financial resources. Mean monthly incomes in the month prior to admission steadily dropped from $347 in FY 1993 to $208 in FY 2003, but have risen slightly for FY2004 to $224. Six out of ten veterans (63.8%) were homeless upon entry to CWT/VI (Table 3).

- In FY 2004, 41.9% of veterans entering the CWT/VI program reported that their usual employment pattern in the past three years was full-time competitive employment, but nine out of ten veterans (91.3%) reported not working at all in the month prior to admission.

- Substance abuse is highly prevalent in this population – at admission, 86.6% of veterans were diagnosed with a substance abuse problem: 73.3% reported problems with alcohol and 63.0% reported a drug problem (Table 4). In addition, over half of veterans (57.8%) reported that they had lost at least one job due to substance abuse (Table 3).

- The proportion of veterans diagnosed with a serious mental illness or with a dual diagnosis (both a substance abuse disorder and a serious mental illness) is at its highest point since FY 1993: 51.2% of admitted veterans received a diagnosis of a serious mental illness, and 42.1% of veterans were dually diagnosed. (Table 4).

- Over half of the veterans in the CWT/VI Program (58.1%) were reported to have a disabling medical condition (Table 4).

Program Participation

- Over half of veterans (54.4%) discharged during FY 2004 were judged by program staff to have successfully completed the program (Table 5).
- During FY 2004, veterans worked an average of 26.5 hours per week in CWT/VI and had an average hourly wage of $5.96, 81 cents above the current minimum wage of $5.15/hour (Table 5).
- The proportion of veterans who had any TWE while in CWT/VI has more than doubled from FY 1993 (30.1%) to FY 2004 (81.9%). Workshop experiences were less common, with 31.5% working in a workshop at least once. (Table 5)
- The majority of placements (both TWE and workshop) are on VA grounds. Over two-thirds (70.8%) of veterans worked in a TWE placement at the VA compared with 15.4% who worked at a TWE in the community. One in four (25.0%) veterans participated in a workshop on VA grounds (Table 5).

Outcomes

- During FY 2004, 41.7% of veterans were discharged from CWT/VI with arrangements to be in competitive employment (full- or part-time). An additional 5.5% had arrangements at the time of discharge to be in some type of constructive activity (e.g. VA's Incentive Therapy, student, trainee or unpaid volunteer) and 11.1% were retired and/or disabled (Table 6).
- Since the first progress report there has been an increase in the percentage of veterans rated as improved in virtually all clinical areas (e.g. alcohol problems, drug problems, mental health problems and medical problems) and work performance areas (e.g. attendance and punctuality, acceptance of supervision, relationship with co-workers, productivity and quality of production), although these percentages have remained relatively unchanged from FY 2002 to FY 2004 (Table 6).

B. VISN Performance

There are CWT/VI Programs located within every VISN. Tables 7, 8a and 8b provide data from FY 2004 on the 13 critical monitor measures organized by VISN. VISNs whose results are considered "outliers" are identified in Tables 7 and 8b with a shaded

box. The performance of all VISNs is used as the norm for evaluating the performance of each individual VISN. Those VISNs that are one standard deviation above or below the mean in the undesirable direction are considered outliers in Table 7. Outcome measures are presented in Tables 8a and 8b. Table 8a reports the raw outcome data by VISN and Table 8b report the same outcome measures, however, they have been risk adjusted using the same baseline characteristics as described earlier for CWT/VI sites (see Chapter I - determining outliers on critical monitors). VISNs that are statistically different in the undesirable direction from the median VISN after risk adjustment are considered outliers.

Table 9 of Appendix B provides a summary of the outlier status of each VISN. A total of 41 outliers out of a total of 286 measurements were identified for the 13 critical monitors across all 22 reporting VISNs. VISNs 1 and 17 had the greatest number of outliers.

C. Site Performance

1. Compliance with Program Monitoring

As a matter of policy, CWT/VI sites are required to submit an Annual Report to VACO by the tenth day of the completion of each fiscal year. Completed Annual Reports are sent to the attention of the Associate Chief for Psychosocial Rehabilitation in Hampton, Virginia. Table 10 of Appendix C compares the number of discharges reported in the FY 2004 Annual Report to VA Central Office with the number of monitoring forms NEPEC received where the last date worked in CWT/VI occurred during FY 2004. In Table 10, there are 114 CWT/VI program site locations listed:
- 108 sites reported discharges to either VACO or NEPEC, and thus were considered to be operational.
- Six sites were considered to be closed during FY 2004: Philadelphia, PA (VISN 4); Durham, NC and Salisbury, NC (VISN 6); Iron Mountain, MI (VISN 12); Sioux Falls, SD (VISN 23); Des Moines, IA (VISN 23).
- While Knoxville submitted 67 discharges to VACO, they did not submit any monitoring data to NEPEC.
- Sites submitted monitoring data on 89.0% (site average) of the discharges they reported in their FY 2004 Annual Report. Eight CWT/VI program site locations were one standard deviation below the mean on proportion of discharges during FY 2004 for which monitoring data were collected.

2. Descriptive Program Measures and Critical Monitor Measures

Tables 11 - 35 report site-specific data for FY 2004. Of the 108 operational sites, data are presented for 95 programs: Sixteen CWT/VI program sites were excluded from these tables because they submitted data on fewer than 10 veterans during FY 2004.[4] Critical monitors have been identified in these tables by shaded column titles (e.g. see Table 27 the column labeled "Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge") and sites whose results are considered "outliers" are identified with a shaded box.

Table 36 provides a summary of the outlier status of each site location. A total of 247 outliers out of 1,274 measurements were identified for the 13 critical monitors across all 95 CWT program site locations. Forty-two of the 95 reporting sites (44.2%) were found to be outliers on one or none of the critical monitors, and 16 of the 95 (14.7%) program site locations were outliers on five or more of the 13 critical monitors.

3. Trend Data on Risk Adjusted Outcome Critical Monitors

The last set of tables in Appendix B, Tables 37a – 37h provide trend data on outcome measures. For each of the eight risk adjusted critical outcome monitors, data from FY 2004 are presented by site with comparative data from previous progress reports (FY1996 and FY1998 through FY 2004).

D. The CWT/VI Program as One Component of the Larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service

Appendix C contains 10 tables summarizing stop code data (see Chapter I) for Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services (PSR), as documented in VA's outpatient care file. Appendix C1 – Appendix C.5 present summary VISN data, while Appendix C.6 – Appendix C.10 present summary site data.

Altogether, 39,704 individual veterans received PSR services during FY 2004 and these veterans, on average, received 27.2 PSR visits. The overall duration of veteran participation in PSR was approximately 3 months (mean = 89.6 days) as determined by dates of their first recorded and last recorded stop codes during FY 2004. Of the 39,704 veterans, 57.6% (n=22,865) received CWT and/or CWT/TR services; 57.6% (n=22,852) received vocational assistance services and 23.5% (n=9,318) received Incentive Therapy services.

---

[4] The 7 CWT site locations excluded from the data tables are: Durham and Salisbury, NC (VISN 6); Lexington, KY (VISN 9); Dayton and Columbus, OH, (VISN 10); Iron Mountain, MI (VISN 12; Poplar Bluff and St. Louis, MO (VISN 15); El Paso, TX (VISN 18); Colorado Springs, CO and Sheridan, WY (VISN 19); Roseburg, OR (VISN 20) Sepulveda, CA (VISN 22); Fargo, ND, Knoxville, IA and Omaha, NE (VISN 23)

Because veterans may receive treatment from a number of programs within the PSR continuum of care, Appendices C5 and C10 report the type service the veterans first received in the PSR continuum of care. Overall, 45.9% of veterans received CWT and/or CWT/TR services first, 43.0% of veterans received vocational assistance services first and 13.6% of veterans received Incentive Therapy services first.

E. Summary

As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT/VI will continue to be an important element in fostering community adjustment and functional rehabilitation of veterans disabled by psychiatric or addictive disorders, particularly CWT transitional work placements that are community-based, and CWT Supported Employment, a vocational service recently added to the array of CWT services.

REFERENCES

Fountaine and Howard. Program Evaluation of the Veterans Administrations Therapeutic Work Programs. Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation Studies and Evaluation Service, Veterans Administration, December 1987.

Bond, G., Becker, D., Drake, R., et al: Implementing Supported Employment as an Evidence-Based Practice. Psychiatric Services, 52: 313-322, 2003.

Leda, C., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Preliminary Information on the Monitoring Efforts of the Compensated Work Therapy Program. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1995.

Resnick, S., Sieffert, D., Medak, S, and Rosenheck, R. Sixth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2004.

Seibyl, C., Baldino, R., Corwel, L., Medak, S. and Rosenheck, R. Fourth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program Fiscal Year 2000. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2001.

Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1996. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1997.

Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Second Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1998. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1999.

Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Third Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1999. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2000.

Seibyl, C.L., Sieffert, D., Medak, S. and Rosenheck, R. Fifth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2002.

APPENDICES

Contents of the Appendices:

Appendix A. Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (Third Version)

Appendix B. CWT/VI Monitoring Data Tables

Appendix C. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Data Tables

Appendix A: Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (Third Version)

For office
use only

FORM __VI__ **(2)**

COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT ADMISSION

Staff Member's Name _____

Admission Date to VI (mm,dd,yy) . . . . ☐☐/☐☐/☐☐ **(8)**

VA Facility Name _____VA Facility Code . . . . ☐☐☐ **(11)**

Two-character alphanumeric station code suffix (if applicable) . . . . ☐☐ **(13)**

VI (or CWT) Subdivision Code (do not use unless you have registered a subdivision and have
received a formal subdivision code from NEPEC). . . . . ☐ **(14)**

PART I INTERVIEW (to be administered to veteran by a clinician)

A. VETERAN DESCRIPTION

1. Veteran's Name (last name, first initial)   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐ **(34)**

2. Social Security Number. . . . . ☐☐☐-☐☐-☐☐☐☐ **(43)**

3. Date of Birth (mm,dd,yy) . . . . ☐☐/☐☐/☐☐ **(49)**

4. Sex **(50)**
        ☐ 1. Male   ☐ 2. Female

5. Ethnicity (check only one) **(51)**
    ☐ 1. Hispanic, white   ☐ 4. Black, not Hispanic   ☐ 6. White
    ☐ 2. Hispanic, black   ☐ 5. Asian   ☐ 7. Other
    ☐ 3. American Indian or Alaskan

6. Marital status (check only one) **(52)**
    ☐ 1. married   ☐ 3. widowed   ☐ 5. divorced
    ☐ 2. remarried   ☐ 4. separated   ☐ 6. never married

**53–56
BLANK**

9. Have you ever worked in VI (or CWT) before this admission? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(57)**

10. What was the highest level you completed in school **(e.g. GED = 12; 1 yr of college = 13)**? ☐☐ **(59)**

11. How many months of training or technical education have you completed
(exclude training in the military)? . . . . (mos) ☐☐ **(61)**

B. EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME HISTORY

12. In your lifetime, what was the year you had your greatest employment earnings? . . . . (year) 19/20 ☐☐ **(63)**

13. Approximately, how much were your employment earnings in that year ($/year)?
(dollar amount only — no cents) . . . . $ ☐☐☐,☐☐☐ **(69)**

**70–75
BLANK**

16. What has been your **usual** employment pattern during the **past three years**? (check only one) **(76)**
    ☐ 1. Full time (regular; ≥ 35 hrs/wk)   ☐ 5. Service/Volunteer
    ☐ 2. Regular part time (< 35 hrs/wk)   ☐ 6. Retired/disabled
    ☐ 3. Irregular part time (day jobs)   ☐ 7. Unemployed
    ☐ 4. Student/training program   ☐ 8. Other

17. What year was the last time you held a job in the community for a month or more? . . . . . . (year) 19/20 ☐☐ **(78)**

**79–82
BLANK**

19. In the last 30 days, how many days did you work for pay? (exclude VI and IT) . . . . (days) ☐☐ **(84)**

20. In the last 30 days, how much money did you receive from employment? (exclude VI and IT)
(dollar amount only — no cents) . . . . $ ☐☐☐☐ **(88)**

For office
use only

21. Do you currently receive any of the following kinds of financial support?
(check one box for each question)

    1. Service Connected Psychiatry (include 0%) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(89)**
    2. Service Connected Other (include 0%) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes
    3. NSC Pension . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes
    4. SSDI (Social Security Disability Insurance) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes
    5. SSI (Supplemental Security Income) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes
    6. Social Security Retirement . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes
    7. Other disability (e.g. workmen's compensation) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes
    8. Other public support (e.g. food stamps, general relief) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(96)**

22. In the past 30 days, how much money did you receive from these sources (dollar amount —
no cents) (code 0000 if veteran does not receive financial support from any of the above)? . $ ☐☐☐☐ **(100)**

C. MILITARY HISTORY

23. Period of Service (check **longest** one) **(101)**

    ☐ 1. Pre-WWII (11/18–11/41) ☐ 5. Between Korean and ☐ 7. Post-Vietnam Era (5/75–7/90)
    ☐ 2. World War II (12/41–12/46)   Vietnam Eras (2/55–7/64) ☐ 8. Persian Gulf (8/90–   )
    ☐ 3. Pre-Korean War (1/47–6/50) ☐ 6. Vietnam Era (8/64–4/75) ☐ 9. Post-Persian Gulf
    ☐ 4. Korean War (7/50–1/55)

24. Did you ever receive hostile or friendly fire in combat zone? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(102)**

D. LIVING SITUATION

25. Where did you usually sleep during the month before you were admitted to the VI (or CWT) program? (select one) **(103)**

    ☐ 1. own apartment, room or house ☐ 5. halfway house, transitional living facility
        (include boarding home) ☐ 6. hotel, Single Room Occupancy (SRO)
    ☐ 2. someone else's apartment, room or house ☐ 7. shelter for the homeless
    ☐ 3. hospital or nursing home ☐ 8. outdoors, abandoned building, car
    ☐ 4. domiciliary ☐ 9. other (specify _____)

        DO NOT CODE ☐☐ **(105)**

26. On the last date you were living in the community (e.g. not in a hospital or a health care
type institution) were you homeless **(lacking a fixed, regular and adequate night-time
residence)** . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(106)**

    **107–109
    BLANK**

    26b. How long was that episode of homelessness (select one)?
    **[Note: Length of time homeless is determined by figuring the number of months or
    years since the veteran last had a fixed, regular and adequate night-time residence,
    minus the time spent in any institution (hospital, halfway house, jail etc.)]** **(110)**

    ☐ 1. less than 1 month ☐ 4. at least 1 year but less than 2 years
    ☐ 2. at least 1 month but less than 6 months ☐ 5. two years or more
    ☐ 3. at least 6 months but less than 1 year ☐ 9. unknown

    **111–112
    BLANK**

E. HEALTH STATUS

29. Have you **ever** been hospitalized for: (check one box for each question)

    1. treatment of alcoholism? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(113)**
    2. treatment of drug problems? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes
    3. a psychiatric problem (include PTSD)? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(115)**

    **116
    BLANK**

For office use only

31. Which of the following health problems do you currently have: (check one box for each question)

    1. medical problem? . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(117)**

    2. problem with alcohol?. . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    3. problem with drugs? . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    4. psychiatric or emotional problem? . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

32. Have you ever lost a job because of alcohol and/or drug problems? . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(121)**

F.   LEGAL HISTORY

33. Have you ever been arrested? (check one) **(122)**

    ❐ 0. no   ❐ 2. yes, 2–5 times   ❐ 4. yes, more than 10 times

    ❐ 1. yes, once   ❐ 3. yes, 6–10 times

34. Have you ever been incarcerated (i.e. been in jail or prison) in your life? (check one) **(123)**

    ❐ 0. no   ❐ 1. yes, less than two weeks   ❐ 2. yes, two weeks or more

PART II CLINICIAN'S OBSERVATIONS AND IMPRESSIONS
(to be completed by a clinician)

35. How was contact with the VI (or CWT) Program initiated? (select one) **(124)**

    ❐ 1. referral from VA inpatient unit   ❐ 4. referral from a non-VA health

    ❐ 2. referral from a VA outpatient program   care provider/agency

    (specify outpt program type _____)   ❐ 5. self-referred

    ❐ 3. referral from a VA domiciliary   ❐ 6. Vet Center referral

                                       ❐ 7. other (specify _____)

                                   DO NOT CODE   ☐☐ **(126)**

36. Is the veteran currently in a VA domiciliary or inpatient unit? . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(127)**

128–141 BLANK

40. Please indicate below the veteran's DSM-III-R diagnosis as determined by professionals
in this program or from the medical record.   (check one box for each question)

    1. PTSD . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(142)**

    2. Anxiety Disorder (other than PTSD) . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    3. Affective Disorder (other than Bipolar Disorder) . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    4. Bipolar Disorder . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(145)**

    5. Schizophrenia . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    6. Psychosis (other than schizophrenia) . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    7. Adjustment Disorder . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(148)**

    8. Alcohol Abuse/Dependence . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    9. Drug Abuse/Dependence . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    10. Personality Disorder . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    11. Other (specify _____) ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(152)**

41. Please indicate below any disabling medical conditions that apply to this veteran as
determined by professionals in this program or from the medical record.   (check one box
for each question)

    1. Head Injury . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(153)**

    2. Cerebro-Vascular Accident (e.g. Stroke) . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    3. Spinal Cord Injury (Paraplegia/Quadriplegia) . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    4. Arthritis . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    5. Multiple Sclerosis . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(157)**

    6. Liver Disease (e.g. Cirrhosis) . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    7. Pulmonary Disease (e.g. COPD) . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    8. Dementia . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    9. Orthopedic Problems (e.g. Back Injuries) . . . . ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes

    10. Other (specify _____) ❐ 0 = No ❐ 1 = Yes **(162)**

                                       DO NOT CODE   ☐☐ **(164)**

<div style="text-align:right">**For office use only**</div>

COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT DISCHARGE

165–170 BLANK

Staff Member's Name _____

Last date worked in VI (or CWT) (mm,dd,yy) . . . . ☐☐/☐☐/☐☐ **(176)**

I.   PARTICIPATION IN VETERANS INDUSTRIES

1. Hours worked in VI (or CWT):

   1. Total hours worked . . . . (hrs) ☐☐☐,☐☐☐ **(182)**

183–185 BLANK

2. Earnings in VI (or CWT):

   1. Total gross earnings (dollar amount — no cents) . . . . $ ☐☐,☐☐☐ **(190)**

191–194 BLANK

3. While in VI (or CWT), did the veteran spend any time in the following job locations?
(check one box for each question)

   1. Workshop on VA grounds . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(195)**

   2. Supported employment (transitional work experience) on VA grounds . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

   3. Workshop in the community . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

   4. Supported employment (transitional work experience) in the community . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(198)**

4. Consider the following work performance and clinical areas and select the description that best
reflects changes that occurred during the veteran's VI (or CWT) admission (check one box for each question).

	9. not applicable	0. deteriorated	1. unchanged	2. improved	
A. Work Performance Areas					
1. Personal hygiene/appearance	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(199)**
2. Attendance and punctuality	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3. Acceptance of supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4. Ability to get along with co-workers	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5. Productivity (output volume)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6. Quality of production	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(204)**
B. Clinical Areas					
7. Alcohol problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(205)**
8. Drug problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9. Mental health problems other than substance abuse .	☐	☐	☐	☐	
10. Medical problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(208)**

5. In your opinion, is this veteran ready for working in full-time competitive employment?. . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(209)**

<div align="center">

Veterans Industries

Monitoring Data Sheet

(Third Version–Revised 9/2000)
Page 5 of 5

</div>

II. DISCHARGE STATUS

6. The veteran's mode of discharge was: (check only one) **(210)**
   - ☐ 1. Mutually agreed upon planned discharge
   - ☐ 2. Involuntary discharge because of failure to comply with program requirements
     (specify _____)
   - ☐ 3. Veteran left the program before planned discharge date and informed staff of his/her departure
   - ☐ 4. Veteran left the program before planned discharge date and **did not** inform staff (AWOL)
   - ☐ 5. Veteran became ill (physically or mentally) and was not able to work in VI (or CWT)
   - ☐ 6. Other (specify _____)

   DO NOT CODE ☐☐ **(212)**

7. Veteran's employment situation after discharge from VI (or CWT) will be: (check only one) **(213)**
   - ☐ 1. Full-time paid competitive employment in the community
   - ☐ 2. Part-time paid competitive employment in the community
   - ☐ 3. VA's Incentive Therapy (IT)
   - ☐ 4. Student/trainee
   - ☐ 5. Unpaid volunteer
   - ☐ 6. Unemployed
   - ☐ 7. Retired/disabled/too ill
   - ☐ 8. Veteran left program without giving indication of his/her employment situation
   - ☐ 9. Other (specify _____)

   DO NOT CODE ☐☐ **(215)**

   216–221 BLANK

10. Veteran's housing situation after discharge from VI (or CWT) will be: (check only one) **(222)**
   - ☐ 1. Institution (e.g. hospital, nursing home, domicilary)
   - ☐ 2. Halfway house/transitional living program
   - ☐ 3. Own apartment, room or house (include boarding home)
   - ☐ 4. Apartment, room or house of friend or family member
   - ☐ 5. No available residence other than homeless shelters, outdoors etc.
   - ☐ 6. Veteran left program without giving indication of his/her housing situation
   - ☐ 7. Other (specify _____)

   DO NOT CODE ☐☐ **(224)**

III. ARRANGEMENTS FOR POST DISCHARGE AFTERCARE

11. If the veteran has arrangements to work in competitive employment after discharge,
   are there plans for VI (or CWT) staff to provide any of the following types of support?
   (check one box for each question)

	0. no	3. yes, weekly	2. yes, monthly	1. yes, less often than monthly	
a. office-based vocational counseling	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(225)**
b. on-the-job support	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(226)**
c. telephone support	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(227)**

Appendix B: CWT/VI Monitoring Data Tables

List of Tables for FY04

Table 1.   CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoriing Data by Site and by Fiscal Year

Table 2.   Sociodemographic Characteristics, Service Era and Referral Source at Admission by Fiscal Year

Table 3.   Employment, Income and Residential History at Admission by Fiscal Year

Table 4.   Legal History, Health Status and Hospitalization History at Admission by Fiscal Year

Table 5.   Program Participation by Fiscal Year

Table 6.   Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Fiscal Year

Table 7.   Program Participation by VISN for FY04

Table 8a.   Unadjusted Critical Outcome Monitor Measures by VISN for FY04

Table 8b.   Percent and Direction from Median Performance of VISN: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY04

Table 9.   Summary of Outliers by VISN for FY04

Table 10.   Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY04

Table 11.   Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY04

Table 12.   Ethnicity by Site for FY04

Table 13.   Marital Status by Site for FY04

Table 14.   Educational History by Site for FY04

Table 15.   Military Service Era by Site for FY04

Table 16.   Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY04

Table 17.   Usual Employment Pattern during the Three Years Prior to Admission by Site for FY04

Table 18. Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY04

Table 19. Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Impatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY04

List of Tables for FY04 (cont.)

Table 1. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year †

VISN	SITE	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY93-FY04
1	White River Jct, VT					7	10	1	0	2	9	18	25	72
1	Bedford, MA	64	385	482	508	539	487	482	348	365	262	290	248	4460
1	Boston, MA		15	4	0	0	0	0	30	51	27	25	35	187
1	Brockton, MA	2	56	124	73	80	154	126	65	87	67	85	118	1037
1	Manchester, NH ††			21	18	22	10							71
1	Northampton, MA	3	35	72	143	123	144	214	231	176	150	113	108	1512
1	Providence, RI	2	7	24	49	65	59	35	33	43	48	52	70	487
1	West Haven, CT		37	69	60	92	69	39	90	87	95	105	85	828
2	Buffalo, NY		2	41	58	72	77	70	43	54	42	71	76	606
2	Canandaigua, NY	4	24	11	26	1	46	77	38	24	34	54	47	386
2	Bath, NY		17	23	31	46	17	39	67	109	116	66	69	600
2	Syracuse, NY	4	25	32	51	40	47	43	64	64	67	46	54	537
2	Albany, NY	11	40	23	69	35	62	43	120	113	112	117	113	858
3	Bronx, NY				11	50	67	77	94	115	121	139	120	794
3	E. Orange, NJ			5	26	166	203	221	159	21	24	20	14	859
3	Lyons, NJ	20	109	94	226	121	57	0†	3	132	158	157	269	1346
3	Montrose, NY			2	37	108	201	182	174	141	75	139	121	1180
3	Brooklyn, NY				6	55	62	45	49	67	57	57	78	476
3	Northport, NY	2	8	30	66	117	155	81	33	97	63	54	28	734
4	Butler, PA				8	6	24	49	49	45	54	27	49	311
4	Coatesville, PA	43	211	194	282	229	252	289	265	261	259	299	289	2873
4	Lebanon, PA		50	85	96	90	105	102	100	94	85	93	75	975
4	Philadelphia, PA ††		1	2	3	29	14	67	46	22	20			204
4	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	9	58	105	157	172	210	153	168	170	182	197	124	1705
4	Wilkes-Barre, PA									2	31	28	10	71
5	Baltimore, MD				8	58	41	27	21	12	48	34	31	280
5	Ft. Howard, MD ††			1	5	10	10	24	15					65
5	Perry Point, MD	5	0	10	26	24	23	33	13	41	142	157	112	586
5	Martinsburg, WV					26	0	217	205	223	212	149	178	1210
5	Washington, DC	4	16	58	52	57	75	40	93	82	123	118	83	801
6	Durham, NC††	0	4	17	19	22	18	19	12	10	2	0		123
6	Hampton, VA	20	124	116	118	113	124	72	75	86	75	91	51	1065
6	Asheville, NC		1	6	4	0	0	9	17	24	16	17	21	115
6	Richmond, VA		6	71	41	42	24	31	2	2	11	17	22	269
6	Salem, VA	4	29	34	27	52	25	68	42	38	39	77	72	507
6	Salisbury, NC††										7	0		7
7	Atlanta, GA		13	228	170	112	139	179	307	195	119	114	173	1749
7	Augusta, GA	4	19	11	30	44	54	60	31	50	42	49	96	490
7	Birmingham, AL						2	59	68	56	62	53	23	323
7	Charleston, SC	5	20	51	47	36	52	64	59	80	80	59	49	602
7	Columbia, SC									1	60	49	103	213
7	Dublin, GA							4	15	0	20	33	30	102
7	Tuskegee, AL									21	37	66	69	193
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	17	86	69	72	61	88	82	76	72	51	98	154	926
8	Bay Pines, FL	2	20	67	71	73	132	165	165	135	103	81	81	1095
8	Miami, FL		15	20	20	30	44	56	39	47	52	40		363
8	W. Palm Beach, FL					19	25	35	38	59	47			223
8	Gainesville, FL			2	9	42	79	85	75	62	63	68	62	547
8	Lake City, FL ††				1	1	14							16
8	Orlando, FL											2	64	66
8	Tampa, FL	1	43	64	66	59	57	87	120	99	76	94	102	868
9	Lexington, KY ††	22	104	101	87	74	62	50	51				3	554
9	Memphis, TN			1	4	32	25	33	39	37	31	37	32	271
9	Mt. Home, TN	5	2	104	88	127	143	139	106	126	86	97	85	1108
9	Murfreesboro, TN	15	82	106	101	122	126	143	156	130	75	54	67	1177
10	Chillicothe, OH	11	116	4	54	87	92	68	85	122	120	143	201	1103
10	Cincinnati, OH									152	112	169	136	569
10	Cleveland, OH	5	85	125	109	120	154	132	145	164	143	99	142	1423
10	Dayton, OH			1	11	13	9	41	21	9	16	17	9	147
10	Columbus, OH												1	1
11	Ann Arbor, MI					5	6	3	14	24	14	29		95
11	Battle Creek, MI		18	78	127	101	83	86	61	57	57	45	53	766
11	Danville, IL	9	13	25	69	1	0	34	34	50	43	31	34	343
11	Indianapolis, IN					16	46	45	39	31	54	65	46	342

Table 1 cont. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year †

VISN	SITE	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY93-FY04
12	North Chicago, IL	16	69	55	76	0	0	111	211	205	165	181	167	1256
12	Hines, IL		51	52	97	121	140	128	160	182	146	91	76	1244
12	Iron Mountain, MI									7	1	0		8
12	Madison, WI										2	17	20	39
12	Tomah, WI		17	48	65	51	33	53	50	77	41	47	70	552
12	Milwaukee, WI		17	72	55	53	66	86	82	69	56	60	50	666
15	Kansas City, MO	4	96	189	159	105	118	129	110	0	7	91	67	1075
15	Columbia, MO			6	9	12	0	15	5	4	0	4	14	69
15	Topeka, KS	1	55	34	84	64	38	23	7	83	27	27	31	474
15	Leavenworth, KS	3	5	9	2	1	9	45	61	3	48	41	58	285
15	St. Louis, MO										1	1	1	3
15	Poplar Bluff, MO				9	11	11	5	6	1	7	2	3	55
16	Biloxi, MS		6	16	54	114	112	122	159	129	131	182	168	1193
16	Houston, TX	2	20	52	81	113	87	114	132	135	146	186	184	1252
16	Jackson, MS				1	11	21	25	44	50	15	41	38	246
16	Little Rock, AR		26	4	22	169	186	205	250	260	212	134	128	1596
16	Oklahoma City, OK		22	32	29	81	48	16	51	46	58	41	78	502
17	Dallas, TX	43	152	231	293	344	278	286	327	346	385	384	422	3491
17	Bonham, TX			17	2	36	39	83	65	65	47	35	39	428
17	Fort Worth, TX									70	61	111	124	366
17	San Antonio, TX			6	18	28	30	19	25	23	24	51	36	260
17	Temple, TX		9	19	45	82	45	33	39	23	117	256	303	971
17	Waco, TX ††	13	61	76	13	5	41	0	2	23	7			241
18	Albuquerque, NM								2	19	59	94	97	271
18	Phoenix, AZ ††					15	56	21	23	52				167
18	Prescott, AZ	7	14	28	29	76	72	87	86	122	63	56	98	738
18	Tucson, AZ			16	41	51	67	51	62	52	59	56	57	512
18	El Paso, TX					2	2	4	2	3	4	3	7	27
19	Colorado Springs, CO										7	11	3	21
19	Salt Lake City, UT	1	14	29	16	24	23	18	23	30	24	21	22	245
19	Sheridan, WY						12	11	11	4	0	11	3	52
20	Anchorage, AK		14	17	45	75	40	21	24	34	32	27	21	350
20	Portland, OR			21	34	19	29	45	80	88	76	88	81	561
20	Roseburg, OR		9	18	15	22	14	30	32	41	9	10	1	201
20	Seattle, WA ††			5	12	20	14	3	6	0	0			60
20	American Lake, WA	5	29	139	89	113	69	68	56	35	50	89	72	814
20	Walla Walla, WA										11	12	11	34
20	White City, OR	3	44	44	115	147	147	168	87	85	92	122	151	1205
21	Honolulu, HI		2	6	8	8	9	9	18	10	16	10	20	116
21	Palo Alto, CA	45	191	59	1	10	52	36	42	47	66	68	75	692
21	Reno, NV		1	3	5	1	12	9	12	12	9	15	12	91
21	San Francisco, CA	8	49	62	86	79	98	88	44	96	99	70	51	830
22	Long Beach, CA		6	4	46	35	59	60	55	23	42	31	30	391
22	Loma Linda, CA		3	44	76	69	73	84	78	89	85	73	77	751
22	San Diego, CA					3	10	21	23	24	45	63	68	257
22	West LA, CA				10	22	0	22	46	5	17	29	11	162
22	Sepulveda, CA	10	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		31
23	Fargo, ND											2	9	11
23	Sioux Falls, SD ††									15	10			25
23	Ft. Meade, SD	3	37	88	82	91	66	58	54	51	57	34	32	653
23	Hot Springs, SD	15	70	96	86	98	66	83	75	83	64	81	76	893
23	Minneapolis, MN								15	12	42	37	58	164
23	Omaha, NE												7	7
23	Des Moines, ††					4	18	27	7	1	0			57
23	Knoxville, IA††	3	29	52	103	44	92	71	45	19	29	12		499
23	St. Cloud, MN	10	62	109	172	178	223	221	181	100	118	256	271	1901
TOTAL		**485**	**3,081**	**4,567**	**5,625**	**6,413**	**6,875**	**7,405**	**7,496**	**7,556**	**7,282**	**7,924**	**8,224**	**72,933**
SITE AVERAGE		**11**	**45**	**55**	**62**	**66**	**68**	**73**	**73**	**70**	**65**	**72**	**77**	**603**
SITE S.D.		**13**	**60**	**70**	**75**	**75**	**74**	**76**	**73**	**70**	**63**	**69**	**73**	**667**

† Due to missing data, fifty-three veterans could not be assigned a fiscal year and three veterans could not be assigned a site.

†† Site has either closed or undergone consolidation.

Table 2. Sociodemographic Characteristics, Service Era and Referral Source at Admission by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3,081	FY95 n=4,567	FY96 n=5,625	FY97 n=6,413	FY98 n=6,875	FY99 n=7,405	FY00 n=7,496	FY01 n=7,556	FY02 n=7,282	FY03 n=7,924	FY04 n=8,224
SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC												
Age (mean years)	43.1	43.0	42.2	43.8	44.4	44.9	45.4	46.0	46.6	47.0	47.4	47.6
Female	3.1%	3.2%	3.4%	4.1%	4.0%	4.5%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%	4.5%	4.2%
Ethnicity												
White	57.1%	55.1%	50.2%	49.5%	50.4%	49.2%	47.0%	44.5%	46.0%	42.8%	42.7%	42.7%
African American	36.0%	39.1%	43.7%	43.2%	41.7%	43.3%	45.9%	48.3%	46.5%	49.7%	50.2%	49.9%
Hispanic	4.4%	3.5%	2.4%	3.6%	4.4%	4.4%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	4.8%	4.7%	4.9%
Other	2.5%	2.3%	3.7%	3.7%	3.5%	3.1%	2.3%	2.6%	3.1%	2.7%	2.4%	2.5%
Marital status												
married	10.7%	9.6%	9.1%	9.3%	9.3%	8.9%	7.8%	7.6%	7.9%	7.6%	8.1%	8.2%
separated/widowed/divorced	58.8%	61.1%	62.1%	61.0%	61.7%	63.0%	63.2%	63.3%	63.7%	64.5%	62.7%	63.3%
never married	31.6%	29.3%	28.9%	29.7%	29.1%	28.1%	29.0%	29.2%	28.5%	27.9%	29.2%	28.5%
Education												
< 12 years	14.2%	12.1%	10.2%	10.0%	11.4%	10.1%	9.8%	8.8%	7.6%	7.8%	7.3%	7.3%
12 years	47.4%	50.5%	50.8%	49.9%	49.5%	49.5%	49.6%	50.0%	50.7%	51.8%	50.7%	52.3%
> 12 years	38.4%	37.5%	39.1%	40.1%	39.1%	40.5%	40.7%	41.3%	41.7%	40.4%	42.0%	40.4%
SERVICE ERA												
Persian Gulf era	1.7%	2.3%	2.7%	3.1%	3.0%	4.0%	4.4%	4.6%	5.0%	5.9%	6.3%	7.8%
Post-Vietnam era	26.5%	29.7%	32.5%	34.4%	35.1%	35.7%	37.7%	40.2%	40.9%	43.2%	47.0%	48.8%
Vietnam era	56.5%	54.8%	53.7%	51.9%	52.8%	52.4%	50.8%	48.8%	48.8%	46.3%	43.2%	40.7%
Between Korean and Vietnam eras	8.1%	8.8%	7.7%	7.7%	6.7%	6.3%	5.8%	5.2%	4.4%	4.0%	3.0%	2.3%
Korean era	4.1%	2.9%	2.2%	2.0%	1.9%	1.3%	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%
All other service eras	3.1%	1.5%	1.2%	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
REFERRAL SOURCE												
VA inpatient unit	33.5%	32.6%	27.6%	24.7%	17.9%	13.9%	13.3%	11.6%	11.0%	11.4%	10.2%	8.5%
VA outpatient program	25.1%	24.7%	27.3%	30.7%	36.1%	38.5%	38.2%	40.5%	40.4%	40.5%	40.5%	40.2%
VA domiciliary	26.2%	26.1%	26.6%	28.5%	31.0%	33.1%	34.4%	32.3%	33.7%	33.4%	33.2%	32.9%
Non-VA health care provider or agency	1.3%	2.7%	2.4%	1.8%	1.7%	2.2%	2.7%	3.5%	3.8%	2.9%	2.6%	3.3%
Self-referred	4.6%	6.9%	10.1%	9.7%	8.4%	7.6%	7.4%	7.8%	7.7%	7.6%	9.0%	10.5%
Vet Center	2.1%	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%	1.4%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%
Other	7.3%	5.9%	4.6%	3.5%	3.7%	3.8%	3.2%	3.3%	2.7%	3.2%	3.2%	3.8%

Table 3. Employment, Income and Residential History at Admission by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3,081	FY95 n=4,567	FY96 n=5,625	FY97 n=6,413	FY98 n=6,875	FY99 n=7,405	FY00 n=7,496	FY01 n=7,556	FY02 n=7,282	FY03 n=7,924	FY04 n=8,224
EMPLOYMENT HISTORY												
Worked previously in CWT	33.1%	27.6%	24.1%	26.8%	26.1%	27.7%	27.7%	29.5%	31.1%	31.6%	31.4%	33.5%
Usual employment pattern past 3 years												
Competitively employed full-time	31.1%	36.1%	37.5%	38.7%	40.1%	40.6%	42.5%	43.3%	44.1%	42.4%	43.0%	41.9%
Competitively emp regular part-time	7.1%	7.3%	9.6%	8.7%	8.4%	7.9%	8.5%	8.4%	8.3%	8.9%	3.4%	9.1%
Competitively emp irregular part-time	21.7%	20.5%	20.7%	19.3%	19.5%	20.6%	20.7%	20.4%	21.0%	22.5%	22.9%	22.6%
Student/trainee	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.5%	0.8%
Unpaid volunteer	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
Retired/disabled	10.5%	9.7%	7.8%	8.3%	7.9%	7.2%	6.0%	6.9%	6.5%	5.6%	5.4%	5.6%
Unemployed	26.2%	23.0%	21.1%	21.2%	20.8%	20.2%	18.6%	17.6%	16.0%	16.6%	16.4%	16.5%
Other	2.2%	2.2%	2.0%	2.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.6%	2.4%	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.2%
Usually employed or involved in constructive activity past 3 years	61.2%	65.1%	69.1%	68.0%	69.2%	70.2%	72.9%	73.0%	74.4%	74.8%	75.1%	74.7%
Days worked for pay past 30 days												
none	87.5%	89.5%	88.8%	88.1%	88.2%	88.3%	88.8%	89.5%	90.7%	90.7%	90.8%	91.3%
1-19 days	8.6%	7.4%	7.4%	8.4%	8.6%	8.0%	8.1%	8.2%	6.8%	7.0%	7.2%	6.7%
> 19 days	4.0%	3.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.2%	3.8%	3.1%	2.3%	2.6%	2.3%	2.1%	2.0%
Mean # of days worked for pay past 30	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0
Ever lost a job due to substance abuse	47.6%	52.9%	55.0%	55.4%	55.9%	55.9%	57.7%	58.5%	58.2%	57.7%	56.6%	57.8%
INCOME HISTORY												
Public Financial Support												
SC psychiatry	10.2%	9.5%	6.7%	6.3%	6.1%	5.4%	5.3%	5.0%	4.8%	4.4%	4.1%	4.1%
SC medical	14.9%	12.4%	11.8%	13.4%	13.4%	12.4%	12.9%	13.5%	12.2%	12.2%	11.9%	12.3%
NSC pension	2.9%	3.9%	3.4%	3.6%	3.6%	3.0%	3.2%	4.8%	4.8%	4.3%	4.5%	4.9%
Receives any VA benefits	25.6%	23.2%	20.3%	21.5%	21.3%	19.1%	19.8%	21.6%	20.2%	19.5%	19.2%	20.0%
Social Security benefits (SSI, SSDI)	22.3%	16.1%	13.1%	15.2%	12.7%	9.1%	9.4%	9.4%	9.0%	8.2%	7.1%	7.3%
Any disability (VA and/or SS)	38.1%	31.9%	27.4%	30.3%	28.3%	24.3%	24.8%	25.2%	23.8%	23.0%	21.4%	21.6%
Mean employment income past 30 days	$51.68	$35.65	$46.36	$45.39	$42.02	$46.60	$45.75	$40.83	$38.78	$37.26	$39.08	$36.04
Mean public support income past 30 days	$302.76	$238.02	$206.55	$231.16	$212.56	$196.80	$192.99	$190.69	$178.23	$173.98	$169.44	$188.35
Total income received past 30 days	$346.80	$270.81	$250.31	$270.96	$246.49	$235.87	$231.47	$227.89	$216.74	$211.09	$208.46	$224.34
RESIDENTIAL HISTORY												
Usual residence past 30 days												
Own apartment, room or house	25.6%	23.8%	20.6%	21.7%	20.8%	18.6%	17.5%	16.9%	17.5%	16.3%	16.8%	16.5%
Apartment, room or house of family or friend	18.5%	15.8%	16.5%	15.6%	13.3%	14.9%	13.6%	14.8%	14.5%	15.8%	16.6%	17.0%
Hospital or nursing home	11.0%	13.1%	13.4%	12.3%	10.7%	9.3%	9.8%	8.6%	6.7%	6.8%	6.2%	5.5%
Domiciliary	19.7%	21.1%	22.4%	23.8%	26.8%	27.4%	27.8%	24.8%	27.3%	26.7%	25.0%	25.9%
Halfway house, transitional living program	5.8%	7.4%	8.3%	9.4%	10.6%	12.0%	14.0%	16.8%	14.3%	14.4%	14.0%	14.7%
Hotel or SRO	3.1%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	1.2%
Shelter	10.8%	12.6%	13.2%	11.6%	12.6%	12.5%	12.0%	12.2%	13.1%	13.4%	14.4%	14.3%
Outdoors, abandoned building etc.	3.9%	4.0%	3.9%	3.9%	3.5%	3.1%	3.4%	3.7%	3.6%	3.6%	4.5%	3.8%
Other	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%	1.7%	1.9%	1.3%	1.2%
Homeless when last living in community	53.4%	56.8%	59.8%	58.2%	57.9%	59.0%	61.8%	60.8%	60.4%	61.7%	62.4%	63.8%
Currently in Domiciliary or Inpatient Unit	55.3%	49.7%	40.5%	40.1%	38.3%	38.5%	39.3%	37.8%	40.4%	41.5%	41.6%	42.3%

Table 4. Legal History, Health Status and Hospitalization History at Admission by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3,081	FY95 n=4,567	FY96 n=5,625	FY97 n=6,413	FY98 n=6,875	FY99 n=7,405	FY00 n=7,496	FY01 n=7,556	FY02 n=7,282	FY03 n=7,924	FY04 n=8,224
LEGAL HISTORY												
Arrest History												
Never been arrested	24.5%	23.0%	21.8%	22.1%	21.9%	21.8%	20.4%	19.0%	19.8%	19.5%	18.3%	18.3%
Arrested once	22.0%	19.6%	18.2%	18.2%	18.9%	18.0%	19.6%	18.5%	18.1%	16.7%	16.6%	16.3%
Arrested 2-5 times	33.7%	35.3%	38.0%	38.5%	38.4%	40.7%	40.1%	40.8%	40.3%	42.3%	43.3%	42.9%
Arrested 6-10 times	9.8%	10.4%	10.9%	10.7%	9.4%	9.3%	10.0%	10.1%	10.8%	10.7%	11.0%	11.2%
Arrested more than 10 times	10.0%	11.8%	11.2%	10.4%	11.4%	10.2%	10.0%	11.6%	11.1%	11.0%	10.9%	11.3%
Incarceration History												
Never incarcerated	38.7%	35.4%	33.9%	34.2%	32.5%	32.8%	31.9%	29.2%	30.8%	31.5%	29.9%	29.8%
Incarcerated less than two weeks	22.6%	25.2%	24.2%	24.5%	24.8%	25.5%	22.6%	23.6%	21.6%	20.0%	19.3%	19.0%
Incarcerated more than two weeks	38.7%	39.4%	41.8%	41.3%	42.7%	41.7%	45.5%	47.2%	47.6%	48.6%	50.8%	51.2%
CLINICAL ASSESSMENTS												
Psychiatric Diagnoses												
Alcohol abuse/dependency	62.7%	69.3%	72.2%	72.2%	73.6%	74.7%	74.3%	74.6%	75.3%	74.5%	73.4%	73.3%
Drug abuse/dependency	43.7%	50.6%	54.4%	55.1%	55.5%	57.7%	59.7%	61.6%	60.2%	62.5%	62.4%	63.0%
Any substance abuse/dependency	72.6%	78.8%	82.3%	82.5%	84.3%	85.6%	85.5%	86.5%	86.8%	86.6%	86.0%	86.6%
Serious mental illness †	46.5%	43.3%	40.9%	43.1%	43.0%	43.3%	45.7%	45.1%	36.0%	39.9%	47.9%	51.2%
Dual diagnosis ††	25.7%	29.5%	29.3%	31.1%	32.6%	34.3%	36.4%	36.3%	28.5%	31.9%	38.9%	42.1%
Any psychiatric disorder	94.8%	95.4%	95.6%	96.4%	96.5%	96.7%	96.9%	97.1%	96.6%	97.2%	97.0%	97.3%
Any disabling medical condition	42.8%	44.8%	46.1%	45.2%	44.2%	45.6%	47.2%	48.7%	51.2%	53.0%	56.7%	58.1%
Any psychiatric disorder or disabling medical condition	98.8%	98.6%	98.9%	99.2%	99.2%	99.5%	99.6%	99.6%	99.7%	99.7%	99.8%	99.7%
HOSPITALIZATION HISTORY												
Ever hospitalized for alcohol problems	64.3%	70.4%	71.7%	71.2%	70.4%	70.8%	70.0%	69.2%	68.2%	65.4%	64.3%	64.0%
Ever hospitalized for drug problems	42.5%	51.1%	53.9%	54.3%	52.8%	53.4%	55.3%	56.3%	54.0%	54.7%	54.2%	54.4%
Ever hospitalized for psychiatric problems	50.8%	49.2%	43.3%	44.9%	42.9%	42.0%	42.9%	42.4%	41.1%	39.0%	37.8%	39.1%
Ever hospitalized for any mental health problem†††	88.8%	91.6%	90.5%	89.7%	88.8%	87.8%	87.4%	86.6%	85.3%	83.4%	81.9%	81.9%

† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories: schizophrenia, other psychotic disorder, affective disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD and other anxiety disorders.

†† Dual Diagnosis is defined as having both a substance abuse disorder and a serious psychiatric disorder.

††† Any mental health problem includes any alcohol, drug or psychiatric problem.

Table 5. Program Participation by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3080	FY95 n=4562	FY96 n=5625	FY97 n=6412	FY98 n=6875	FY99 n=7405	FY00 n=7496	FY01 n=7554	FY02 n=7285	FY03 n=7851	FY04 n=8,224
TYPE OF DISCHARGE												
Mutually agreed upon/planned discharge	42.1%	41.4%	39.1%	43.1%	44.6%	46.9%	51.2%	51.3%	51.3%	53.1%	53.7%	54.4%
Failure to comply with program requirements	9.2%	12.7%	14.0%	15.6%	16.0%	17.0%	16.1%	15.3%	17.3%	16.6%	15.9%	16.7%
Left before planned discharge (informed staff)	14.5%	14.0%	14.0%	12.1%	14.3%	13.9%	11.7%	12.3%	11.5%	11.8%	11.1%	10.0%
Left before planned discharge (did not inform staff)	23.8%	24.9%	26.7%	21.6%	19.0%	16.7%	15.9%	15.0%	14.4%	13.4%	14.2%	13.0%
Veteran became too ill to participate	9.4%	5.6%	4.7%	5.4%	4.7%	4.4%	4.0%	4.2%	4.1%	4.0%	4.2%	4.7%
Other	1.1%	1.4%	1.5%	2.2%	1.4%	1.1%	1.2%	1.9%	1.4%	1.1%	1.0%	1.0%
HOURS AND EARNINGS IN CWT/VI												
Total mean hours worked in CWT/VI	77.0	224.2	374.6	462.1	510.9	515.6	556.9	538.4	492.9	548.9	535.2	539.0
Mean hours worked per week	19.9	21.7	23.8	23.3	25.3	25.4	25.5	26.1	25.8	26.3	26.2	26.5
Mean weeks worked	3.9	10.0	15.5	19.0	19.6	19.9	21.7	21.2	19.0	20.7	19.9	20.0
Total mean earnings in CWT/VI	$307.94	$1,025.07	$1,835.60	$2,277.83	$2,573.87	$2,819.27	$3,235.00	$3,107.16	$2,896.83	$3,321.20	$3,216.65	$3,342.85
Mean hourly wage	$3.82	$4.23	$4.59	$4.49	$4.88	$5.29	$5.51	$5.59	$5.73	$5.83	$5.93	$5.96
Mean weekly earnings	$83.28	$99.02	$118.95	$113.49	$133.23	$142.29	$146.63	$155.60	$152.10	$159.80	$160.51	$164.88
LOCATION OF CWT PARTICIPATION												
Any Workshop Placement	84.1%	78.1%	68.0%	66.8%	58.2%	51.5%	42.3%	41.2%	37.4%	34.7%	32.0%	31.5%
Workshop on VA Grounds	76.1%	73.4%	56.0%	56.0%	49.2%	43.2%	33.4%	30.2%	27.4%	27.2%	25.1%	25.0%
Workshop in the Community	9.5%	63.6%	13.8%	12.6%	10.4%	10.4%	11.1%	12.4%	10.9%	8.9%	8.5%	8.5%
Workshop placement only	67.2%	55.8%	40.4%	36.3%	29.7%	34.5%	19.1%	20.3%	20.4%	16.9%	17.8%	17.6%
Any Transitional Work Experience Placement	30.1%	43.3%	58.8%	62.6%	69.7%	75.1%	80.5%	79.2%	78.7%	82.7%	81.8%	81.9%
Transitional Work Experience on VA Grounds	15.1%	25.9%	46.4%	52.5%	58.4%	63.0%	67.4%	67.7%	66.6%	69.6%	68.8%	70.8%
Transitional Work Experience in the Community	16.1%	20.1%	16.2%	14.7%	16.8%	17.6%	18.1%	16.5%	16.5%	18.2%	17.6%	15.4%
Transitional Work Experience Only	14.2%	21.1%	31.3%	32.0%	41.2%	48.1%	57.2%	58.3%	61.7%	65.0%	67.6%	68.0%

Table 6. Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3,081	FY95 n=4,567	FY96 n=5,625	FY97 n=6,413	FY98 n=6,875	FY99 n=7,405	FY00 n=7,496	FY01 n=7,556	FY02 n=7,282	FY03 n=7,924	FY04 n=8,224
IMPROVEMENT IN WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS†												
Personal hygiene/appearance	18.8%	23.9%	29.0%	34.2%	45.8%	55.9%	62.0%	66.2%	67.2%	70.5%	70.5%	71.5%
Attendance and punctuality	22.0%	27.2%	31.5%	36.7%	48.4%	56.2%	61.0%	61.2%	63.8%	65.8%	66.5%	67.1%
Acceptance of Supervision	23.7%	31.4%	34.6%	39.8%	49.6%	58.3%	62.9%	64.2%	66.4%	69.6%	70.1%	70.4%
Relationship with co-workers	23.3%	32.9%	35.0%	40.1%	50.1%	57.6%	62.9%	64.7%	66.5%	69.4%	69.5%	70.5%
Productivity	40.4%	41.7%	39.2%	44.6%	55.1%	62.1%	64.9%	66.4%	67.0%	69.6%	70.3%	69.9%
Quality of production	35.4%	40.2%	38.9%	43.9%	54.0%	61.2%	64.9%	66.6%	67.7%	69.9%	70.7%	70.4%
Average work improvement score ††	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.29	1.41	1.50	1.55	1.57	1.60	1.62	1.64	1.64
VETERAN IS READY FOR COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT	38.4%	42.7%	42.9%	45.9%	51.3%	54.8%	59.8%	60.3%	59.7%	61.6%	64.3%	64.7%
IMPROVEMENT IN CLINICAL AREAS †												
Alcohol problems	26.3%	28.6%	31.8%	34.4%	45.5%	55.3%	61.2%	63.4%	63.8%	65.8%	65.8%	66.5%
Drug problems	19.4%	25.0%	26.4%	31.0%	42.5%	53.7%	59.9%	62.9%	62.3%	64.6%	64.3%	65.5%
Mental health problems	21.4%	22.1%	20.0%	22.7%	32.8%	41.1%	45.5%	47.1%	48.9%	51.5%	52.5%	54.5%
Medical problems	10.6%	12.1%	14.2%	12.9%	23.7%	31.1%	34.9%	35.2%	39.6%	39.9%	39.2%	40.4%
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT DISCHARGE												
Competitively employed full-time	15.5%	17.1%	22.5%	24.3%	28.5%	32.4%	34.0%	36.5%	37.3%	34.9%	35.1%	36.9%
Competitively employed part-time	5.8%	3.8%	2.9%	4.0%	4.6%	4.7%	4.9%	4.8%	3.9%	5.1%	4.8%	4.8%
Incentive Therapy (IT)	2.1%	2.3%	2.8%	1.7%	1.4%	1.3%	1.5%	1.5%	1.3%	1.5%	1.6%	1.9%
Student/trainee	2.9%	3.1%	2.6%	3.3%	3.2%	2.5%	3.1%	3.2%	2.8%	2.9%	2.9%	3.1%
Unpaid volunteer	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%
Unemployed	20.3%	26.1%	27.8%	29.2%	29.5%	27.7%	27.6%	24.6%	25.8%	26.8%	27.5%	26.2%
Retired/disabled	16.4%	13.6%	8.9%	10.9%	10.7%	10.2%	9.4%	10.5%	10.9%	10.4%	10.8%	11.1%
Unknown	30.2%	28.1%	28.1%	23.3%	19.3%	18.8%	15.8%	14.8%	14.4%	13.4%	13.0%	11.8%
Other	6.6%	5.8%	4.0%	3.0%	2.4%	2.1%	3.4%	3.9%	3.3%	4.4%	3.8%	3.7%
HOUSING STATUS AT DISCHARGE												
Hospital, nursing home or domiciliary	26.8%	21.6%	16.3%	14.3%	13.4%	13.9%	13.1%	13.5%	13.1%	13.7%	12.9%	12.6%
Halfway house/transitional living program	3.5%	5.0%	4.6%	6.7%	7.2%	8.5%	9.3%	10.9%	11.6%	13.4%	12.6%	13.5%
Own apartment, room or house	23.5%	27.9%	29.6%	35.0%	37.2%	36.3%	38.8%	35.4%	33.7%	33.3%	35.0%	37.3%
Apartment, room, house of family/friend	11.5%	12.0%	14.8%	13.5%	15.8%	16.8%	15.8%	16.8%	17.3%	17.9%	18.1%	16.5%
No available residence/homeless	3.7%	2.8%	4.8%	5.9%	5.4%	4.7%	4.7%	5.2%	6.2%	5.8%	5.6%	4.8%
Unknown	30.2%	29.9%	28.6%	23.1%	20.0%	18.6%	16.9%	16.8%	16.4%	14.3%	14.6%	13.9%
Other	0.9%	1.0%	1.3%	1.5%	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.7%	1.5%	1.2%	1.5%

† Improvement is noted for only those veterans with problems in that area.

†† Average Work Improvement score is the mean of five work performance areas, range 0-2 (0 = deteriorated, 1 = unchanged, and 2 = improved).

Table 7. Program Participation by VISN for FY04

	VISN †		VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION			
			Serious Mental Illness ††	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements	Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week	Average Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI
VISN	#SITES	N	%	%	%	%	$
1	7	689	70.2%	50.8%	17.4%	**18.2**	7.56
2	5	359	58.8%	63.8%	18.1%	30.0	**5.15**
3	6	630	44.0%	71.6%	13.8%	33.6	6.06
4	5	547	**37.7%**	48.6%	8.8%	27.5	5.31
5	4	404	54.2%	64.1%	11.9%	29.7	5.34
6	4	166	**33.7%**	63.3%	18.7%	31.7	5.62
7	8	697	47.1%	51.6%	**24.8%**	33.3	5.64
8	6	396	**35.9%**	69.7%	10.6%	33.3	5.44
9	4	187	46.0%	**42.2%**	**32.1%**	31.5	5.39
10	5	489	49.1%	53.8%	17.6%	**19.6**	5.91
11	4	162	60.5%	47.5%	17.3%	29.1	5.91
12	5	383	49.6%	60.1%	19.6%	27.4	6.40
15	6	174	67.2%	48.9%	**24.7%**	30.7	5.74
16	5	596	42.1%	**44.1%**	14.9%	31.5	5.89
17	5	924	56.0%	**41.2%**	21.5%	**15.2**	5.40
18	4	259	62.5%	49.4%	12.4%	24.9	5.90
19	3	28	71.4%	67.9%	0.0%	26.0	5.93
20	6	337	58.8%	58.2%	16.0%	24.6	6.38
21	4	158	50.6%	53.2%	13.9%	26.7	8.51
22	5	186	54.3%	58.1%	8.1%	**19.9**	6.06
23	8	453	50.7%	57.5%	12.2%	28.2	6.58
VISN Avg			**52.4%**	**55.5%**	**15.9%**	**27.3**	**$6.01**
VISN S.D.			**10.7%**	**8.9%**	**6.8%**	**5.3**	**0.79**
VETERAN Avg			**51.2%**	**54.4%**	**16.7%**	**26.5**	**$5.96**

† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.
†† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories:
schizophrenia, other psychotic disorder, affective disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD and other anxiety disorders.

Table 8a. Unadjusted Critical Outcome Monitor Measures by VISN for FY04

VISN †			AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
VISN	#SITES	# VETS								
1	7	689	1.44	50.9%	50.2%	40.1%	27.0%	29.8%	39.2%	11.8%
2	5	359	1.53	65.4%	63.3%	49.6%	34.7%	37.3%	28.7%	5.8%
3	6	630	1.62	72.1%	71.6%	65.1%	63.6%	52.4%	17.9%	6.2%
4	5	547	1.86	91.5%	89.4%	75.9%	42.8%	44.6%	22.7%	19.2%
5	4	404	1.72	75.6%	77.5%	62.5%	41.1%	36.6%	29.7%	8.2%
6	4	166	1.83	76.8%	77.6%	58.1%	30.4%	53.0%	30.7%	4.8%
7	8	697	1.62	66.1%	64.0%	63.0%	51.9%	47.3%	20.2%	10.3%
8	6	396	1.76	84.6%	82.7%	73.0%	21.5%	65.4%	15.2%	9.1%
9	4	187	1.64	61.4%	59.6%	46.6%	45.3%	36.9%	31.0%	17.1%
10	5	489	1.85	79.8%	79.5%	74.2%	63.0%	40.5%	20.4%	10.6%
11	4	162	1.42	49.3%	42.6%	34.6%	21.5%	35.8%	27.2%	10.5%
12	5	383	1.81	80.8%	82.5%	65.7%	46.3%	49.3%	27.4%	5.0%
15	6	174	1.69	64.2%	67.6%	62.5%	54.2%	44.3%	20.7%	14.9%
16	5	596	1.58	60.8%	58.1%	34.8%	15.0%	41.1%	34.4%	11.7%
17	5	924	1.48	42.4%	43.1%	41.8%	34.7%	29.3%	29.9%	22.1%
18	4	259	1.61	70.3%	71.4%	56.0%	48.2%	37.5%	26.3%	12.4%
19	3	28	1.72	66.7%	70.0%	58.3%	14.3%	60.7%	7.1%	17.9%
20	6	337	1.61	67.1%	64.4%	62.0%	56.6%	46.0%	17.8%	9.5%
21	4	158	1.52	55.8%	60.0%	38.8%	33.3%	40.5%	27.8%	13.9%
22	5	186	1.79	78.4%	79.5%	65.0%	55.0%	39.8%	14.5%	8.6%
23	8	453	1.60	70.0%	62.1%	45.1%	36.4%	38.0%	33.1%	11.5%
VISN Average			**1.65**	**68.1%**	**67.5%**	**55.9%**	**39.8%**	**43.1%**	**24.9%**	**11.5%**
VISN SD			**0.13**	**12.2%**	**12.8%**	**13.0%**	**14.9%**	**9.2%**	**7.7%**	**4.7%**
Veteran Average				**66.5%**	**65.5%**	**54.5%**	**40.4%**	**41.7%**	**26.2%**	**11.8%**

† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

†† Only veterans with a problem in this area were included.

Table 8b. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of VISN: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY04 †

				ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
VISN Median Value			1.64	67.1%	64.4%	65.1%	45.3%	44.6%	27.2%	9.5%
Veteran Average			1.64	66.5%	65.5%	54.5%	40.4%	41.6%	26.2%	11.8%
VISN†† VISN	**#SITES**	**# VETS**	**AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT**							
1	7	689	-0.13	-13.7%	-12.5%	-14.6%	-5.6%	-6.3%	12.7%	1.1%
2	5	359	-0.09	-4.1%	-10.8%	-10.2%	-5.8%	-4.3%	1.6%	-4.6%
3	6	630	-0.03	6.3%	1.6%	0.0%	20.8%	-7.9%	-8.9%	-5.0%
4	6	547	0.23	34.1%	25.3%	23.9%	6.9%	0.0%	-4.3%	7.3%
5	4	404	0.09	12.7%	9.8%	7.0%	-0.1%	-6.3%	2.5%	-2.8%
6	6	166	0.20	11.9%	11.6%	4.1%	-13.9%	7.9%	3.6%	-7.4%
7	8	697	0.01	0.5%	-5.0%	14.4%	10.4%	4.4%	-6.6%	-1.2%
8	5	396	0.12	18.3%	15.0%	21.6%	-18.8%	19.8%	-11.9%	-2.0%
9	3	187	0.00	-7.5%	-11.8%	-11.7%	0.0%	-6.4%	4.4%	6.3%
10	4	489	0.24	22.2%	18.1%	28.9%	29.3%	-2.3%	-6.0%	-0.5%
11	4	162	-0.16	-18.0%	-3.1%	-17.6%	-18.9%	-3.6%	0.0%	-1.3%
12	6	383	0.17	10.9%	10.4%	4.6%	2.2%	6.6%	1.0%	-5.4%
15	6	174	0.05	-4.7%	-4.5%	4.3%	20.0%	1.1%	-6.9%	4.1%
16	5	596	-0.05	-15.6%	-23.4%	-29.5%	-30.5%	-3.3%	7.2%	0.3%
17	6	924	-0.12	-18.5%	-31.3%	-16.0%	-1.1%	-12.4%	2.3%	10.1%
18	4	259	-0.02	0.9%	5.0%	-8.2%	3.0%	-4.2%	-0.7%	2.8%
19	3	28	0.15	-4.6%	9.3%	-2.5%	-7.9%	21.6%	-19.4%	8.0%
20	6	337	-0.01	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	15.3%	4.3%	-9.2%	0.0%
21	4	158	-0.06	-10.9%	-10.7%	-20.5%	-10.3%	4.6%	0.7%	3.4%
22	5	186	0.22	16.0%	17.8%	11.6%	22.6%	3.4%	-11.2%	-1.3%
23	8	453	-0.01	5.6%	-2.2%	-5.4%	-0.1%	-4.1%	6.1%	0.7%

† Outcomes have been adjusted for the following veteran characteristics: Age, race, gender, previous employment history, residential history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses; including serious psychiatric illness and substance abuse problems.

†† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

††† Only veterans with a problem in this area were included.

Table 9. Summary of Outliers by VISN for FY04 †

VISN	Number of Sites in VISN ††	Number of Veterans in VISN †††	VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
1	7	689	0	1	6	7
2	5	359	0	1	1	2
3	6	630	0	0	0	0
4	5	547	1	0	1	2
5	4	404	0	0	1	1
6	4	166	1	0	0	1
7	8	697	0	1	0	1
8	6	396	1	0	1	2
9	4	187	0	2	1	3
10	5	489	0	1	0	1
11	4	162	0	0	5	5
12	5	383	0	0	0	0
15	6	174	0	1	0	1
16	5	596	0	1	4	5
17	5	924	0	2	6	8
18	4	259	0	0	0	0
19	3	28	0	0	0	0
20	6	337	0	0	0	0
21	4	158	0	1	0	1
22	5	186	0	0	1	1
23	8	453	0	0	0	0
TOTALS			**3**	**11**	**27**	**41**
VISN AVG			**0.1**	**0.5**	**1.3**	**2.0**
VISN SD			**0.3**	**0.7**	**2.0**	**2.3**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10; Dayton and Columbus; VISN 12; Iron Mountain; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19; Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Includes all sites for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms on veterans discharged during FY04.

††† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

Table 10. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY04

VISN		SITE	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY04	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY04	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms	Percent of Discharges During FY04 for which Monitoring Data were Collected †
			N	N	N	%
1	405	White River Junction	25	25	0	100.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	465	-217	53.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	44	-9	79.5%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	114	4	103.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	97	11	111.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	90	-20	77.8%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	87	-2	97.7%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	73	3	104.1%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	43	4	109.3%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	82	-13	84.1%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	54	0	100.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	113	0	100.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	117	3	102.6%
3	561	East Orange, NJ	14	11	3	127.3%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	169	100	159.2%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	121	0	100.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	90	-12	86.7%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	125	-97	**22.4%**
4	529	Butler, PA	49	49	0	100.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	371	-82	77.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	75	0	100.0%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA				closed
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	176	-52	70.5%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	0	10	
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	37	-6	83.8%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	129	-17	86.8%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	177	1	100.6%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	84	-1	98.8%
6	558	Durham, NC				closed
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	99	-48	51.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	22	-1	95.5%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	21	1	104.8%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	68	4	105.9%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	0	0		closed
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	174	-1	99.4%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	99	-3	97.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	35	-12	65.7%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	55	-6	89.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	85	18	121.2%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	30	0	100.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	147	-78	**46.9%**
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	193	-39	79.8%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	85	-4	95.3%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	43	-3	93.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	33	14	142.4%
8	573	Gainesville, FL	62	61	1	101.6%
8	573OR	Orlando, FL	64	0	64	
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	176	-74	58.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY	3	2	1	150.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	31	1	103.2%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	85	0	100.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	82	-15	81.7%

Table 10 cont. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY04

VISN		SITE	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY04 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY04 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY04 for which Monitoring Data were Collected †, †† %
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	190	11	105.8%
10	539	Cinninati, OH	136	154	-18	88.3%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	143	-1	99.3%
10	552	Dayton, OH	9	13	-4	69.2%
10	757	Columbus, OH	1	1	0	100.0%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	48	-19	60.4%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	58	-5	91.4%
11	550	Danville, IL	34	40	-6	85.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	43	3	107.0%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	166	1	100.6%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	84	-8	90.5%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI				closed
12	607	Madison, WI	20	20	0	100.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	71	-1	98.6%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	55	-5	90.9%
15	543	Columbia, MO	67	24	43	279.2%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	14	79	-65	**17.7%**
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	33	-2	93.9%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	56	2	103.6%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	1	4	-3	**25.0%**
15	657	St.Louis, MO	3	30	-27	**10.0%**
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	172	-4	97.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	169	15	108.9%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	36	2	105.6%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	128	0	100.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	82	-4	95.1%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	425	-3	116.7%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	40	-1	97.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	230	-106	53.9%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	38	-2	94.7%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	264	39	114.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	97	0	100.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	97	1	101.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	57	0	100.0%
18	756	El Paso, TX	7	7	0	100.0%
19	567GB	Colorado Springs, CO	3	3	0	100.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	21	1	104.8%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	3	19	-16	**15.8%**
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	23	-2	91.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	81	0	100.0%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR ††	1	24	-23	**4.2%**
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	126	-54	57.1%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	12	-1	91.7%
20	692	White City, OR	151	148	3	102.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	21	-1	95.2%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	73	2	102.7%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	11	1	109.1%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	53	-2	96.2%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	37	-7	81.1%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	80	-3	96.3%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	22	46	309.1%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	172	-161	**6.4%**
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	0	12	-12	**0.0%**

Table 10 cont. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY04

VISN		SITE	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY04 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY04 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY04 for which Monitoring Data were Collected †, †† %
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	9	11	-2	81.8%
23	438	**Sioux Falls, SD**				closed
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	3	29	1066.7%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	68	8	111.8%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	68	-10	85.3%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	7	9	-2	77.8%
23	636A6	**Des Moines, IA**				closed
23	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	0	67	-67	0.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	275	-4	98.5%
Total			**8,224**	**9,237**	**-1,013**	**89.0%**
Site Average			**75**	**85**	**-9**	**89.0%**
Site S.D.			**73**	**83**	**37**	**40.9%**

† A percentage greater than 100% indicates a site that reported more discharges to NEPEC than to VAHQ.

†† Data from Eugene and Roseburg are combined.

Table 11. Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Age	GENDER	
					% males	% females
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	47.6	92.0%	8.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	48.5	98.4%	1.6%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	44.7	74.3%	25.7%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	46.8	97.4%	2.6%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	47.7	96.3%	3.7%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	49.2	94.3%	5.7%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	47.9	91.8%	8.2%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	48.4	94.7%	5.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	47.1	95.7%	4.3%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	45.2	98.6%	1.4%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	47.2	98.1%	1.9%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	46.8	100.0%	0.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	47.6	100.0%	0.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	48.1	92.9%	7.1%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	47.3	95.5%	4.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	47.0	95.0%	5.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	49.3	98.7%	1.3%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	47.1	96.4%	3.6%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	46.7	100.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	47.3	96.5%	3.5%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	45.8	97.3%	2.7%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	47.4	96.0%	4.0%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	46.2	100.0%	0.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	48.3	90.3%	9.7%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	46.7	89.2%	10.8%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	47.2	97.2%	2.8%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	48.1	96.4%	3.6%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	46.3	96.0%	4.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	48.3	95.2%	4.8%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	50.6	95.5%	4.5%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	46.7	93.1%	6.9%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	47.0	91.3%	8.7%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	47.0	89.6%	10.4%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	46.0	78.3%	21.7%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	47.4	95.8%	4.2%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	48.8	95.1%	4.9%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	46.9	100.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	47.1	94.2%	5.8%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	47.7	92.9%	7.1%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	48.7	91.4%	8.6%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	49.4	95.0%	5.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	48.0	100.0%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	47.0	93.5%	6.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	47.1	94.1%	5.9%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	45.9	95.2%	4.8%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	47.3	96.9%	3.1%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	47.6	98.8%	1.2%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	49.5	91.0%	9.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	46.5	98.0%	2.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	46.1	95.5%	4.5%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	45.1	88.0%	12.0%

Table 11 cont. Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Age	GENDER	
					% males	% females
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	51.3	96.6%	3.4%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	46.8	100.0%	0.0%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	47.8	100.0%	0.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	48.2	97.8%	2.2%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	47.2	96.4%	3.6%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	49.3	98.7%	1.3%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	45.6	90.0%	10.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	47.9	98.6%	1.4%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	48.4	98.0%	2.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	46.8	98.5%	1.5%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	47.9	100.0%	0.0%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	50.5	87.1%	12.9%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	48.6	100.0%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	49.1	95.8%	4.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	49.4	98.9%	1.1%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	47.4	92.1%	7.9%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	46.2	97.7%	2.3%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	47.0	96.2%	3.8%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	47.7	96.9%	3.1%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	49.2	97.4%	2.6%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	48.4	92.7%	7.3%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	46.6	94.4%	5.6%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	45.7	94.1%	5.9%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	47.4	97.9%	2.1%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	49.2	96.9%	3.1%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	48.1	94.7%	5.3%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	48.6	90.9%	9.1%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	47.5	100.0%	0.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	48.9	95.0%	5.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	44.8	93.1%	6.9%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	48.8	100.0%	0.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	49.0	98.7%	1.3%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	46.6	100.0%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	48.7	98.7%	1.3%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	56.1	100.0%	0.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	50.0	94.1%	5.9%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	49.6	93.3%	6.7%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	47.4	96.1%	3.9%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	49.1	95.6%	4.4%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	50.0	100.0%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	48.6	100.0%	0.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	48.8	96.0%	4.0%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	49.7	100.0%	0.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	48.4	98.1%	1.9%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**47.6**	**95.8%**	**4.2%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**47.8**	**95.6%**	**4.4%**
SITE S.D.				**1.6**	**4.2%**	**4.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 12. Ethnicity by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	White %	African American %	Hispanic %	Other %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	84.0%	4.0%	12.0%	0.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	77.8%	15.3%	2.4%	4.4%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	68.6%	25.7%	2.9%	2.9%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	69.8%	21.6%	4.3%	4.3%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	74.1%	21.3%	3.7%	0.9%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	75.7%	15.7%	2.9%	5.7%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	56.0%	39.3%	2.4%	2.4%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	34.2%	60.5%	2.6%	2.6%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	66.0%	27.7%	6.4%	0.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	44.9%	50.7%	4.3%	0.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	46.3%	38.9%	7.4%	7.4%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	37.2%	56.6%	5.3%	0.9%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	3.3%	70.8%	24.2%	1.7%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	14.3%	78.6%	0.0%	7.1%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	28.0%	66.7%	5.3%	0.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	30.6%	58.7%	9.1%	1.7%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	7.7%	76.9%	14.1%	1.3%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	50.0%	32.1%	10.7%	7.1%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	40.8%	57.1%	0.0%	2.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	23.2%	68.0%	4.9%	3.9%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	40.0%	54.7%	2.7%	2.7%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	41.9%	53.2%	4.0%	0.8%
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	12.9%	83.9%	0.0%	3.2%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	32.4%	59.5%	3.6%	4.5%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	25.3%	70.2%	2.2%	2.2%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	7.2%	86.7%	1.2%	4.8%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	23.5%	76.5%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	4.5%	95.5%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	40.3%	55.6%	4.2%	0.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	11.0%	85.5%	3.5%	0.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	19.8%	78.1%	2.1%	0.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	8.7%	91.3%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	24.5%	75.5%	0.0%	0.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	19.6%	79.4%	1.0%	0.0%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	13.3%	86.7%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	14.5%	76.8%	4.3%	4.3%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	33.1%	66.9%	0.0%	0.0%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	70.4%	25.9%	2.5%	1.2%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	25.0%	60.0%	12.5%	2.5%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	63.8%	25.5%	10.6%	0.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	46.8%	46.8%	3.2%	3.2%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	52.0%	42.2%	5.9%	0.0%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	40.6%	50.0%	6.3%	3.1%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	31.3%	68.8%	0.0%	0.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	64.7%	34.1%	0.0%	1.2%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	46.3%	52.2%	0.0%	1.5%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	66.3%	29.6%	2.0%	2.0%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	31.9%	65.2%	3.0%	0.0%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	31.2%	67.4%	0.7%	0.7%
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	72.4%	24.1%	3.4%	0.0%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	30.2%	66.0%	0.0%	3.8%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	32.4%	55.9%	8.8%	2.9%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	43.5%	50.0%	4.3%	2.2%

Table 12 cont. Ethnicity by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	White %	African American %	Hispanic %	Other %
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	26.3%	70.7%	2.4%	0.6%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	24.3%	71.6%	4.1%	0.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	75.0%	20.0%	5.0%	0.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	75.4%	18.8%	0.0%	5.8%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	50.0%	48.0%	2.0%	0.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	38.8%	56.7%	4.5%	0.0%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	71.4%	21.4%	0.0%	7.1%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	73.3%	20.0%	3.3%	3.3%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	56.9%	41.4%	1.7%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	50.0%	47.0%	3.0%	0.0%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	24.5%	65.2%	9.2%	1.1%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	34.2%	65.8%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	38.3%	60.2%	0.8%	0.8%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	58.4%	29.9%	1.3%	10.4%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	23.0%	75.6%	0.2%	1.2%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	56.4%	43.6%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	39.5%	54.8%	5.6%	0.0%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	36.1%	36.1%	25.0%	2.8%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	50.5%	38.9%	9.2%	1.3%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	43.3%	15.5%	35.1%	6.2%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	77.6%	11.2%	9.2%	2.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	68.4%	17.5%	12.3%	1.8%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	74.1%	13.6%	6.2%	6.2%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	52.8%	43.1%	1.4%	2.8%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	72.7%	9.1%	18.2%	0.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	75.5%	16.6%	5.3%	2.6%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	30.0%	15.0%	5.0%	50.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	44.0%	45.3%	5.3%	5.3%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	91.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	43.1%	35.3%	19.6%	2.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	40.0%	43.3%	16.7%	0.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	46.8%	28.6%	19.5%	5.2%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	52.9%	27.9%	11.8%	7.4%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	9.1%	90.9%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	43.8%	3.1%	6.3%	46.9%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	63.5%	10.8%	1.4%	24.3%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	63.8%	27.6%	5.2%	3.4%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	57.2%	38.7%	1.1%	3.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**42.7%**	**50.0%**	**4.8%**	**2.5%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**44.5%**	**45.3%**	**4.9%**	**3.2%**
SITE S.D.				**22.8%**	**24.9%**	**6.2%**	**7.3%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 13. Marital Status by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Married %	Separated, Widowed or Divorced %	Never Married %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	5.2%	56.0%	38.7%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	0.0%	51.4%	48.6%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	6.8%	59.8%	33.3%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	8.3%	63.9%	27.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	12.9%	67.1%	20.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	4.8%	63.1%	32.1%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	13.2%	60.5%	26.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	34.0%	38.3%	27.7%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	2.9%	55.1%	42.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	7.4%	61.1%	31.5%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	8.0%	50.4%	41.6%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	9.3%	53.4%	37.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	15.4%	53.8%	30.8%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	8.2%	59.0%	32.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	4.1%	55.4%	40.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	5.1%	59.0%	35.9%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	3.6%	75.0%	21.4%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	8.3%	64.6%	27.1%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	4.6%	65.6%	29.8%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	8.0%	54.7%	37.3%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	7.3%	52.8%	39.8%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	6.5%	54.8%	38.7%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	12.5%	57.1%	30.4%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	7.9%	57.3%	34.8%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	14.6%	53.7%	31.7%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	9.8%	51.0%	39.2%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	4.8%	81.0%	14.3%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	27.3%	36.4%	36.4%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	9.9%	57.7%	32.4%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	5.2%	70.3%	24.4%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	12.5%	66.7%	20.8%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	8.7%	82.6%	8.7%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	4.2%	70.8%	25.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	10.7%	65.0%	24.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	0.0%	79.3%	20.7%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	8.7%	68.1%	23.2%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	15.6%	70.1%	14.3%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	6.3%	70.0%	23.8%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	5.0%	65.0%	30.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	8.5%	63.8%	27.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	4.8%	69.4%	25.8%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	9.2%	67.3%	23.5%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	0.0%	56.3%	43.8%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	6.3%	81.3%	12.5%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	5.9%	76.5%	17.6%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	9.0%	83.6%	7.5%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	8.5%	65.5%	26.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	9.8%	66.2%	24.1%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	9.9%	59.6%	30.5%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	20.7%	65.5%	13.8%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	7.5%	71.7%	20.8%
11	550	Danville, IL	34	0.0%	70.6%	29.4%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	10.9%	60.9%	28.3%

Table 13 cont. Marital Status by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Married %	Separated, Widowed or Divorced %	Never Married %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	9.0%	62.3%	28.7%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	14.7%	50.7%	34.7%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	5.0%	65.0%	30.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	8.6%	64.3%	27.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	8.0%	62.0%	30.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	3.0%	73.1%	23.9%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	21.4%	71.4%	7.1%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	6.5%	74.2%	19.4%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	12.3%	68.4%	19.3%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	4.3%	74.1%	21.6%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	9.8%	64.7%	25.5%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	13.9%	55.6%	30.6%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	0.8%	75.8%	23.4%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	5.1%	80.8%	14.1%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	9.0%	61.8%	29.1%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	10.3%	71.8%	17.9%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	10.6%	70.7%	18.7%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	13.9%	52.8%	33.3%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	5.0%	69.3%	25.7%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	7.3%	58.3%	34.4%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	6.1%	69.4%	24.5%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	12.5%	71.4%	16.1%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	4.5%	68.2%	27.3%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	4.8%	61.9%	33.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	12.3%	56.8%	30.9%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	0.0%	81.8%	18.2%
20	692	White City, OR	151	4.7%	71.1%	24.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	0.0%	70.0%	30.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	4.0%	54.7%	41.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	15.7%	60.8%	23.5%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	6.7%	66.7%	26.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	15.6%	66.2%	18.2%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	9.0%	41.8%	49.3%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	6.3%	75.0%	18.8%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	4.1%	75.3%	20.5%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	5.2%	58.6%	36.2%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	7.8%	56.5%	35.7%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**8.2%**	**63.4%**	**28.5%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**8.4%**	**62.6%**	**26.9%**
SITE S.D.				**5.7%**	**12.9%**	**9.5%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 14. Educational History by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	< 12 Years %	12 Years %	> 12 Years %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	16.0%	36.0%	48.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	6.9%	51.2%	41.9%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	5.7%	60.0%	34.3%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	3.4%	53.4%	43.2%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	8.3%	53.7%	38.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	10.0%	41.4%	48.6%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	9.4%	52.9%	37.6%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	3.9%	52.6%	43.4%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	6.4%	76.6%	17.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	2.9%	60.9%	36.2%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	7.4%	48.1%	44.4%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	9.7%	49.6%	40.7%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	6.7%	47.5%	45.8%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	7.1%	35.7%	57.1%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	7.1%	51.7%	41.3%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	7.4%	50.4%	42.1%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	11.5%	50.0%	38.5%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	21.4%	57.1%	21.4%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	2.0%	55.1%	42.9%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	6.6%	59.2%	34.3%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	5.3%	58.7%	36.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	4.8%	53.2%	41.9%
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	12.9%	45.2%	41.9%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	14.3%	48.2%	37.5%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	23.6%	42.7%	33.7%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	4.8%	45.8%	49.4%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	13.7%	64.7%	21.6%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	9.5%	66.7%	23.8%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	9.1%	40.9%	50.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	9.7%	50.0%	40.3%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	7.5%	38.7%	53.8%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	4.2%	42.7%	53.1%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	0.0%	60.9%	39.1%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	6.1%	61.2%	32.7%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	9.7%	41.7%	48.5%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	6.7%	70.0%	23.3%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	4.3%	47.8%	47.8%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	7.8%	56.5%	35.7%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	8.6%	51.9%	39.5%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	2.5%	45.0%	52.5%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	8.5%	48.9%	42.6%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	0.0%	64.5%	35.5%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	2.9%	55.9%	41.2%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	1.6%	78.1%	20.3%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	3.1%	59.4%	37.5%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	14.1%	48.2%	37.6%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	9.0%	62.7%	28.4%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	12.9%	51.7%	35.3%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	5.1%	59.6%	35.3%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	8.5%	57.0%	34.5%
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	13.8%	41.4%	44.8%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	9.4%	52.8%	37.7%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	14.7%	50.0%	35.3%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	10.9%	54.3%	34.8%

Table 14 cont. Educational History by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	< 12 Years %	12 Years %	> 12 Years %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	8.4%	56.9%	34.7%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	7.9%	35.5%	56.6%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	7.1%	48.6%	44.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	8.0%	62.0%	30.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	4.5%	52.2%	43.3%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	0.0%	64.3%	35.7%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	6.5%	54.8%	38.7%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	8.6%	62.1%	29.3%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	8.9%	53.6%	37.5%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	6.0%	51.1%	42.9%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	0.0%	60.5%	39.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	7.8%	60.2%	32.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	3.8%	44.9%	51.3%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	5.7%	56.2%	38.2%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	7.7%	53.8%	38.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	8.1%	62.9%	29.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	11.1%	36.1%	52.8%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	3.0%	55.4%	41.6%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	5.2%	34.0%	60.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	1.0%	43.9%	55.1%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	7.0%	42.1%	50.9%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	0.0%	63.6%	36.4%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	4.8%	66.7%	28.6%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	9.9%	49.4%	40.7%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	2.8%	41.7%	55.6%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	18.2%	45.5%	36.4%
20	692	White City, OR	151	10.6%	51.0%	38.4%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	10.0%	55.0%	35.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	4.0%	53.3%	42.7%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	8.3%	66.7%	25.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	5.9%	47.1%	47.1%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	0.0%	63.3%	36.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	10.4%	45.5%	44.2%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	5.9%	39.7%	54.4%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	0.0%	54.5%	45.5%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	3.1%	43.8%	53.1%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	2.6%	52.6%	44.7%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	6.9%	44.8%	48.3%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	7.0%	54.2%	38.7%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**7.3%**	**52.3%**	**40.3%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**6.9%**	**52.8%**	**40.3%**
SITE S.D.				**4.5%**	**9.0%**	**8.9%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 15. Military Service Era by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Persian Gulf %	Post-Vietnam %	Vietnam %	Pre-Vietnam %	Korean %	All Other Service Eras %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	8.0%	60.0%	32.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	4.5%	43.1%	49.6%	2.0%	0.0%	0.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	11.4%	54.3%	31.4%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	17.1%	43.6%	36.8%	0.9%	1.7%	0.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	9.3%	44.4%	40.7%	4.6%	0.9%	0.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	8.6%	34.3%	52.9%	1.4%	2.9%	0.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	10.7%	42.9%	42.9%	2.4%	1.2%	0.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	1.3%	52.6%	44.7%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	4.3%	68.1%	25.5%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	4.3%	65.2%	29.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	9.3%	51.9%	35.2%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	11.6%	47.3%	39.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	8.3%	58.3%	31.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	0.0%	50.0%	42.9%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	7.6%	56.8%	33.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	9.9%	57.9%	28.9%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	7.7%	37.2%	50.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	14.3%	35.7%	46.4%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	12.2%	53.1%	34.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	7.6%	54.5%	36.5%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	9.3%	54.7%	34.7%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	5.6%	53.2%	39.5%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	9.7%	32.3%	54.8%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	7.1%	51.8%	39.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	10.7%	51.1%	36.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	4.9%	54.9%	39.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	8.0%	46.0%	46.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	4.8%	42.9%	47.6%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	0.0%	40.9%	59.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	11.1%	48.6%	40.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	5.2%	56.4%	36.6%	1.2%	0.6%	0.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	8.3%	51.2%	38.1%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	13.6%	50.0%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	6.1%	51.0%	40.8%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	6.8%	42.7%	46.6%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	10.3%	44.8%	44.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	8.7%	46.4%	43.5%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	5.8%	54.5%	39.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	9.9%	40.7%	45.7%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	5.0%	52.5%	40.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	10.6%	40.4%	46.8%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	4.9%	45.9%	49.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	10.8%	45.1%	39.2%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	10.9%	62.5%	25.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	6.3%	50.0%	40.6%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	3.5%	57.6%	37.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	1.5%	38.8%	58.2%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	17.4%	40.3%	38.3%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	6.6%	55.9%	35.3%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	3.5%	73.2%	22.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 15 cont. Military Service Era by Site for FY04 †

VISN	SITE	N	Persian Gulf %	Post-Vietnam %	Vietnam %	Pre-Vietnam %	Korean %	All Other Service Eras %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	3.4%	31.0%	55.2%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	15.1%	47.2%	37.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	11.8%	38.2%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	10.9%	47.8%	37.0%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	3.0%	55.1%	41.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	6.6%	31.6%	57.9%	2.6%	1.3%	0.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	15.0%	60.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	4.3%	52.9%	37.1%	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	0.0%	50.0%	42.0%	6.0%	2.0%	0.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	6.0%	59.7%	32.8%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	21.4%	35.7%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	6.7%	26.7%	63.3%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	0.0%	60.3%	36.2%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	8.9%	39.9%	48.2%	2.4%	0.6%	0.0%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	2.7%	41.0%	54.6%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	7.9%	44.7%	47.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	5.5%	57.0%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	10.4%	49.4%	37.7%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	5.5%	51.9%	40.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.2%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	2.6%	41.0%	53.8%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	16.1%	29.0%	50.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	8.3%	61.1%	27.8%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	12.5%	54.1%	31.4%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	6.2%	59.8%	29.9%	2.1%	2.1%	0.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	6.1%	33.7%	58.2%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	1.8%	50.9%	43.9%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	9.1%	40.9%	40.9%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	9.5%	57.1%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	8.6%	34.6%	51.9%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	27.8%	38.9%	31.9%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	9.1%	45.5%	36.4%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	6.0%	39.1%	53.0%	1.3%	0.7%	0.0%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	5.0%	50.0%	45.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	4.0%	48.0%	45.3%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	0.0%	8.3%	75.0%	8.3%	8.3%	0.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	2.0%	35.3%	56.9%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	3.3%	33.3%	63.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	13.0%	33.8%	49.4%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	5.9%	50.0%	38.2%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	0.0%	45.5%	36.4%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	9.4%	53.1%	31.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	5.4%	43.2%	47.3%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	5.2%	39.7%	50.0%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	7.4%	50.2%	36.2%	3.7%	0.4%	2.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**7.8%**	**48.8%**	**40.7%**	**2.3%**	**0.3%**	**0.1%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**5.2%**	**47.3%**	**42.1%**	**2.6%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**
SITE S.D.				**7.4%**	**10.0%**	**9.5%**	**2.8%**	**1.1%**	**0.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 16. Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	VA Inpatient %	VA Outpatient %	VA Domiciliary %	Non-VA Health Care %	Self- Referred %	Vet Center %	Other %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	12.0%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	8.0%	0.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	6.9%	27.8%	40.3%	4.0%	13.7%	0.4%	6.9%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	22.9%	54.3%	14.3%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	33.9%	16.1%	44.9%	4.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	13.0%	13.9%	0.0%	64.8%	7.4%	0.9%	0.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	8.6%	64.3%	2.9%	10.0%	7.1%	1.4%	5.7%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	2.4%	89.4%	2.4%	0.0%	2.4%	2.4%	1.2%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	0.0%	90.8%	2.6%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	1.3%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	4.3%	6.4%	61.7%	8.5%	14.9%	4.3%	0.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	0.0%	83.3%	3.7%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	6.2%	16.8%	24.8%	5.3%	40.7%	0.9%	5.3%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	0.0%	27.5%	2.5%	11.7%	47.5%	1.7%	9.2%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	0.0%	92.9%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	0.8%	4.1%	95.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	0.0%	56.4%	20.5%	17.9%	1.3%	0.0%	3.8%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	3.6%	92.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	1.0%	6.6%	92.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	94.7%	4.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	4.8%	27.4%	51.6%	0.0%	5.6%	5.6%	4.8%
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	30.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	3.2%	93.5%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	68.8%	1.8%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.2%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	0.0%	11.2%	87.1%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	2.4%	88.0%	4.8%	0.0%	1.2%	2.4%	1.2%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	3.9%	11.8%	84.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	76.2%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	9.5%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	0.0%	95.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	13.9%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	4.2%	76.4%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	0.0%	93.1%	0.0%	0.6%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	2.1%	81.3%	4.2%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	2.1%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	4.3%	78.3%	0.0%	8.7%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	1.0%	89.3%	0.0%	2.9%	4.9%	1.9%	0.0%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	0.0%	3.3%	96.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	8.7%	27.5%	55.1%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	4.3%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	0.0%	67.5%	0.0%	0.6%	29.9%	0.0%	1.9%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	5.1%	10.1%	67.1%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	10.1%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	32.5%	65.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	12.8%	83.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	1.6%	17.7%	0.0%	0.0%	9.7%	0.0%	71.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	1.0%	91.2%	0.0%	1.0%	2.9%	1.0%	2.9%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	7.8%	29.7%	0.0%	29.7%	21.9%	10.9%	0.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	15.6%	75.0%	0.0%	3.1%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	0.0%	98.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	19.9%	75.1%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	0.7%	17.6%	51.5%	4.4%	22.1%	0.0%	3.7%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	0.7%	39.4%	59.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 16 cont. Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	VA Inpatient %	VA Outpatient %	VA Domiciliary %	Non-VA Health Care %	Self- Referred %	Vet Center %	Other %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	13.8%	72.4%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	6.9%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	45.3%	52.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
11	550	Danville, IL	34	2.9%	97.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	0.0%	69.6%	0.0%	17.4%	8.7%	0.0%	4.3%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	8.4%	20.4%	69.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	17.3%	77.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	1.3%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	5.0%	35.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	55.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	2.9%	61.4%	0.0%	27.1%	7.1%	0.0%	1.4%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	6.0%	10.0%	68.0%	0.0%	12.0%	4.0%	0.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	65.7%	29.9%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	7.1%	71.4%	0.0%	7.1%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	12.9%	58.1%	19.4%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	3.2%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	0.0%	8.6%	91.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	6.0%	10.1%	83.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	1.6%	95.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	10.5%	47.4%	0.0%	2.6%	34.2%	2.6%	2.6%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	0.0%	21.9%	45.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	9.0%	83.3%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	3.8%	59.5%	2.6%	1.2%	32.0%	0.2%	0.7%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	4.0%	0.0%	1.6%	2.4%	90.3%	1.6%	0.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	19.5%	17.8%	33.0%	3.3%	24.1%	2.0%	0.3%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	38.1%	22.7%	0.0%	6.2%	32.0%	0.0%	1.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	1.0%	2.0%	78.6%	7.1%	10.2%	0.0%	1.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	7.0%	56.1%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	0.0%	90.9%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	4.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	4.8%	4.8%	66.7%	4.8%	9.5%	0.0%	9.5%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	0.0%	54.3%	7.4%	6.2%	29.6%	0.0%	2.5%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	13.9%	30.6%	25.0%	0.0%	11.1%	8.3%	11.1%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	0.0%	81.8%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%
20	692	White City, OR	151	4.0%	0.7%	95.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	5.0%	85.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	5.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	9.3%	21.3%	48.0%	2.7%	14.7%	2.7%	1.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	0.0%	74.5%	0.0%	13.7%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	8.8%	73.5%	1.5%	7.4%	4.4%	2.9%	1.5%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	9.4%	46.9%	15.6%	6.3%	12.5%	9.4%	0.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	1.3%	0.0%	96.1%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	13.8%	27.6%	6.9%	27.6%	20.7%	3.4%	0.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	4.8%	13.3%	67.9%	0.0%	11.1%	1.5%	1.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**8.5%**	**40.0%**	**33.1%**	**3.3%**	**10.5%**	**0.9%**	**3.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**9.2%**	**46.7%**	**24.0%**	**3.4%**	**8.8%**	**1.0%**	**4.9%**
SITE S.D.				**16.6%**	**35.0%**	**34.7%**	**8.6%**	**13.9%**	**2.2%**	**12.9%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04:   VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 17. Usual Employment Pattern during the Three Years Prior to Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Usually Employed or in a Constructive Activity†† %	Retired or Disabled %	Usually Unemployed %	Other %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	32.0%	40.0%	20.0%	8.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	56.7%	15.4%	19.4%	8.5%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	37.1%	20.0%	14.3%	28.6%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	76.3%	7.6%	11.9%	4.2%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	64.8%	5.6%	22.2%	7.4%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	44.3%	27.1%	24.3%	4.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	53.6%	13.1%	28.6%	4.8%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	53.9%	13.2%	31.6%	1.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	85.1%	0.0%	10.6%	4.3%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	86.8%	0.0%	11.8%	1.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	72.2%	5.6%	14.8%	7.4%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	69.9%	8.0%	19.5%	2.7%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	54.2%	4.2%	38.1%	3.4%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	76.9%	0.0%	23.1%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	90.9%	0.0%	5.7%	3.4%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	76.7%	0.0%	19.2%	4.2%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	29.5%	1.3%	66.7%	2.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	82.1%	0.0%	14.3%	3.6%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	85.7%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	77.0%	1.8%	13.1%	8.1%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	62.7%	0.0%	37.3%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	77.4%	3.2%	18.5%	0.8%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	90.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	61.3%	3.2%	35.5%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	77.8%	5.6%	13.9%	2.8%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	80.3%	3.9%	13.5%	2.2%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	74.7%	1.2%	18.1%	6.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	90.2%	0.0%	7.8%	2.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	66.7%	9.5%	19.0%	4.8%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	81.8%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	86.1%	4.2%	9.7%	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	87.7%	0.0%	11.7%	0.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	75.0%	9.4%	13.5%	2.1%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	82.6%	8.7%	8.7%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	83.7%	4.1%	8.2%	4.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	79.6%	3.9%	15.5%	1.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	93.3%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	87.0%	1.4%	8.7%	2.9%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	66.2%	14.3%	16.9%	2.6%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	78.8%	1.3%	18.8%	1.3%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	82.5%	0.0%	17.5%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	91.5%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	77.4%	4.8%	16.1%	1.6%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	99.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	95.3%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	71.9%	0.0%	21.9%	6.3%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	95.3%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	71.6%	16.4%	10.4%	1.5%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	61.4%	14.2%	14.7%	9.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	83.1%	11.0%	4.4%	1.5%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	68.1%	1.4%	29.8%	0.7%

Table 17 cont. Usual Employment Pattern during the Three Years Prior to Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Usually Employed or in a Constructive Activity†† %	Retired or Disabled %	Usually Unemployed %	Other %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	41.4%	20.7%	24.1%	13.8%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	69.8%	3.8%	24.5%	1.9%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	73.5%	8.8%	8.8%	8.8%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	71.7%	4.3%	23.9%	0.0%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	84.4%	1.2%	14.4%	0.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	68.4%	18.4%	11.8%	1.3%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	70.0%	10.0%	15.0%	5.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	71.4%	10.0%	14.3%	4.3%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	70.0%	8.0%	22.0%	0.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	86.6%	3.0%	6.0%	4.5%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	57.1%	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	87.1%	3.2%	6.5%	3.2%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	82.8%	1.7%	15.5%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	91.1%	0.6%	7.1%	1.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	69.2%	5.5%	15.9%	9.3%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	78.9%	5.3%	13.2%	2.6%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	82.8%	0.0%	17.2%	0.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	67.5%	3.9%	26.0%	2.6%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	74.0%	5.7%	17.2%	3.1%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	74.4%	0.0%	25.6%	0.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	65.9%	9.8%	23.6%	0.8%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	69.4%	0.0%	30.6%	0.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	81.2%	1.3%	14.5%	3.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	75.3%	6.2%	17.5%	1.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	86.7%	4.1%	8.2%	1.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	67.9%	3.6%	26.8%	1.8%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	68.2%	9.1%	9.1%	13.6%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	76.2%	0.0%	23.8%	0.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	81.5%	2.5%	14.8%	1.2%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	70.4%	5.6%	21.1%	2.8%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	54.5%	9.1%	27.3%	9.1%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	74.8%	4.6%	19.2%	1.3%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	61.1%	22.2%	16.7%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	60.8%	2.7%	31.1%	5.4%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	58.3%	25.0%	8.3%	8.3%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	62.7%	13.7%	21.6%	2.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	50.0%	16.7%	30.0%	3.3%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	64.9%	9.1%	18.2%	7.8%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	42.6%	17.6%	33.8%	5.9%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	72.7%	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	87.5%	0.0%	9.4%	3.1%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	78.7%	8.0%	12.0%	1.3%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	93.1%	1.7%	5.2%	0.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	85.1%	4.9%	10.1%	0.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**74.7%**	**5.5%**	**16.6%**	**3.2%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**73.1%**	**6.1%**	**17.4%**	**3.4%**
SITE S.D.				**14.1%**	**7.2%**	**9.8%**	**4.3%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Includes full- and part-time employment, student and/or volunteer.

Table 18. Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	0 Days %	1-19 Days %	> 19 Days %	Mean Number of Days Worked for Pay Past 30 #	Mean Employment Income Past 30 Days $
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	96.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.1	$4.80
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	89.9%	8.5%	1.6%	0.9	$61.75
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	97.1%	2.9%	0.0%	0.1	$14.29
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	95.7%	2.6%	1.7%	0.7	$23.52
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	98.1%	1.9%	0.0%	0.2	$11.20
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	97.1%	2.9%	0.0%	0.4	$12.83
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	95.2%	3.6%	1.2%	0.5	$11.98
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	97.4%	2.6%	0.0%	0.2	$7.89
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	88.9%	7.4%	3.7%	1.6	$58.70
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	92.9%	5.3%	1.8%	0.8	$24.33
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	94.2%	5.0%	0.8%	0.8	$30.39
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	98.1%	1.5%	0.4%	0.2	$6.26
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0	$0.17
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	85.7%	3.6%	10.7%	2.7	$44.50
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	93.9%	4.1%	2.0%	0.9	$8.98
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	95.5%	3.5%	1.0%	0.5	$15.10
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	96.8%	1.6%	1.6%	0.5	$20.00
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.4	$18.40
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	93.5%	6.5%	0.0%	0.6	$19.23
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	94.6%	3.6%	1.8%	0.6	$17.23
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	95.2%	3.6%	1.2%	0.6	$33.13
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	92.2%	3.9%	3.9%	1.1	$73.65
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	3.0	$116.81
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	77.3%	18.2%	4.5%	1.7	$227.18
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	86.1%	9.7%	4.2%	1.7	$51.32
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	80.3%	16.8%	2.9%	1.5	$59.40
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	85.4%	11.5%	3.1%	1.3	$45.29
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	82.6%	8.7%	8.7%	2.8	$97.26
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	87.8%	8.2%	4.1%	1.6	$58.57
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	62.1%	24.3%	13.6%	5.9	$214.77
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	90.9%	5.8%	3.2%	1.4	$58.03
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	95.1%	2.5%	2.5%	0.7	$11.69
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	77.5%	20.0%	2.5%	1.5	$56.20
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	95.7%	4.3%	0.0%	0.1	$9.57
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	85.5%	11.3%	3.2%	1.8	$59.65
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	95.3%	4.7%	0.0%	0.3	$10.94
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	84.4%	12.5%	3.1%	2.0	$53.13
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	98.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.2	$11.94
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	89.6%	9.0%	1.5%	1.0	$44.86
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	97.8%	1.5%	0.7%	0.3	$10.50
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	97.9%	1.4%	0.7%	0.3	$5.49

Table 18 cont. Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	0 Days %	1-19 Days %	> 19 Days %	Mean Number of Days Worked for Pay Past 30 #	Mean Employment Income Past 30 Days $
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	86.2%	13.8%	0.0%	1.4	$41.72
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	94.3%	5.7%	0.0%	0.4	$14.62
11	550	Danville, IL	34	88.2%	5.9%	5.9%	2.1	$54.18
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	89.1%	8.7%	2.2%	1.3	$46.52
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	99.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1	$6.23
12	578	Hines, IL	76	92.1%	7.9%	0.0%	0.4	$16.97
12	607	Madison, WI	20	85.0%	15.0%	0.0%	0.4	$15.75
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	87.1%	11.4%	1.4%	0.9	$59.69
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	94.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.3	$11.00
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	82.1%	11.9%	6.0%	2.2	$76.16
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	71.0%	16.1%	12.9%	4.4	$95.65
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	94.8%	1.7%	3.4%	0.8	$23.28
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	93.5%	6.0%	0.6%	0.4	$10.31
16	580	Houston, TX	184	93.5%	2.2%	4.3%	1.1	$25.93
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	52.6%	44.7%	2.6%	3.6	$135.26
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	92.2%	7.8%	0.0%	0.8	$27.03
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	97.4%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0	$1.15
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	84.1%	13.5%	2.4%	1.4	$41.51
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	72.6%	19.4%	8.1%	3.3	$93.97
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	91.7%	2.8%	5.6%	1.9	$25.00
17	674	Temple, TX	303	85.5%	9.9%	4.6%	2.0	$91.18
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	76.3%	23.7%	0.0%	1.5	$75.22
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	98.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.5	$19.39
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	96.5%	0.0%	3.5%	0.7	$31.58
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	90.5%	4.8%	4.8%	1.7	$60.57
20	648	Portland, OR	81	77.8%	18.5%	3.7%	1.9	$88.23
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	90.3%	9.7%	0.0%	0.6	$33.06
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	72.7%	27.3%	0.0%	1.5	$86.82
20	692	White City, OR	151	98.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.3	$5.89
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	85.0%	15.0%	0.0%	0.8	$60.50
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	90.7%	8.0%	1.3%	1.2	$54.27
21	654	Reno, NV	12	83.3%	8.3%	8.3%	1.9	$77.08
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	94.1%	3.9%	2.0%	0.8	$44.47
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	70.0%	16.7%	13.3%	3.9	$137.90
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	97.4%	2.6%	0.0%	0.1	$4.68
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	89.7%	7.4%	2.9%	1.3	$43.60
22	691	West LA, CA	11	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	81.3%	15.6%	3.1%	1.8	$84.69
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	98.3%	1.7%	0.0%	0.1	$6.03
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	86.7%	10.0%	3.3%	1.7	$69.15
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**91.4%**	**6.6%**	**2.0%**	**1.0**	**$36.04**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**90.8%**	**7.1%**	**2.1%**	**1.0**	**$38.08**
SITE S.D.				**9.2%**	**7.7%**	**3.0%**	**1.1**	**$42.47**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 19. Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Prior CWT/VI Admission %	Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	50.0%	8.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	65.3%	49.6%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	60.0%	34.3%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	52.1%	83.1%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	64.5%	4.6%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	32.9%	27.1%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	25.3%	15.3%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	42.1%	1.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	21.7%	53.2%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	34.8%	98.6%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	40.7%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	38.4%	0.9%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	32.8%	2.5%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	35.7%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	62.2%	100.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	20.0%	79.2%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	37.2%	19.2%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	53.6%	0.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	24.5%	98.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	37.8%	92.7%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	26.7%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	45.2%	51.2%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	10.0%	20.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	25.8%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	32.1%	83.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	22.5%	86.5%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	30.1%	3.6%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	12.5%	84.3%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	19.0%	4.8%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	22.7%	4.5%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	50.0%	6.9%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	22.5%	0.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	24.0%	41.7%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	19.0%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	34.7%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	11.8%	1.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	13.3%	96.7%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	34.8%	56.5%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	30.7%	1.3%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	28.8%	70.9%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	5.0%	17.5%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	20.9%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	21.0%	1.6%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	13.7%	0.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	4.7%	100.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	34.4%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	15.3%	100.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	14.9%	1.5%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	43.4%	59.7%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	31.9%	54.4%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	21.3%	60.6%

Table 19 cont. Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Prior CWT/VI Admission %	Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	37.9%	6.9%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	32.1%	7.5%
11	550	Danville, IL	34	44.1%	2.9%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	30.4%	2.2%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	22.2%	72.5%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	35.5%	1.3%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	20.0%	10.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	37.1%	48.6%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	26.0%	76.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	49.3%	20.9%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	7.1%	16.7%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	53.3%	9.7%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	8.8%	89.7%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	41.3%	86.3%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	37.9%	1.6%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	28.9%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	25.8%	44.5%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	34.6%	2.6%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	45.0%	6.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	12.8%	100.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	43.9%	0.8%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	8.3%	0.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	31.5%	86.1%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	31.6%	39.2%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	27.6%	81.6%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	16.1%	1.8%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	31.8%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	28.6%	61.9%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	18.5%	1.2%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	20.8%	41.7%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	9.1%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	151	18.5%	97.4%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	20.0%	5.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	19.2%	44.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	41.7%	8.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	32.0%	5.9%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	33.3%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	26.0%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	13.2%	1.5%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	45.5%	9.1%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	53.1%	3.1%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	32.9%	96.1%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	15.5%	10.3%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	45.6%	72.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				33.5%	42.5%
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				30.2%	32.1%
SITE S.D.				13.8%	36.2%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 20. Veterans' Report of Public Financial Support at Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Service Connected for Psychiatry %	Service Connected for Other %	Non-Service Connected Pension %	Any VA Benefit %	Social Security Disability %	Any VA or Non-VA Disability %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	20.0%	24.0%	8.0%	40.0%	28.0%	48.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	6.5%	9.3%	7.3%	19.8%	15.7%	27.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	14.3%	14.3%	8.6%	34.3%	5.7%	31.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	5.1%	11.0%	7.6%	23.7%	14.4%	27.1%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	4.6%	14.8%	4.6%	23.1%	13.9%	27.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	10.0%	20.0%	21.4%	48.6%	32.9%	54.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	12.9%	14.1%	7.1%	31.8%	27.1%	44.7%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	7.9%	10.5%	7.9%	23.7%	9.2%	25.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	2.1%	4.3%	2.1%	8.5%	2.1%	8.5%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	2.9%	4.3%	0.0%	7.2%	1.4%	8.7%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	1.9%	25.9%	3.7%	29.6%	11.1%	35.2%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	6.2%	10.6%	13.3%	29.2%	10.6%	25.7%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	0.8%	8.3%	7.5%	16.7%	5.0%	14.2%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	14.3%	7.1%	0.0%	21.4%	7.1%	28.6%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	1.1%	11.9%	1.5%	14.1%	3.3%	13.4%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	4.1%	10.7%	1.7%	14.9%	1.7%	14.9%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	9.0%	9.0%	12.8%	29.5%	15.4%	29.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	0.0%	14.3%	7.1%	21.4%	21.4%	28.6%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	0.0%	12.2%	0.0%	12.2%	2.0%	14.3%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	3.5%	10.7%	1.0%	13.8%	3.1%	15.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	2.7%	4.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	6.5%	16.1%	4.8%	22.6%	12.1%	26.6%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	0.0%	6.5%	9.7%	16.1%	12.9%	16.1%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	3.6%	10.7%	3.6%	17.0%	7.1%	19.6%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	2.2%	17.4%	7.3%	25.3%	3.4%	20.2%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	6.0%	16.9%	1.2%	24.1%	3.6%	25.3%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	3.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	4.8%	4.8%	9.5%	19.0%	9.5%	19.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	4.5%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	4.2%	11.1%	6.9%	19.4%	11.1%	20.8%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	0.6%	13.9%	0.6%	14.5%	0.0%	15.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	2.1%	15.6%	9.4%	26.0%	6.3%	21.9%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	0.0%	4.3%	4.3%	8.7%	4.3%	8.7%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	2.0%	18.4%	0.0%	20.4%	10.2%	28.6%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	1.9%	13.6%	8.7%	23.3%	2.9%	17.5%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	3.3%	13.3%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	7.2%	15.9%	7.2%	29.0%	7.2%	29.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	5.8%	13.0%	3.9%	22.7%	16.2%	33.8%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	4.9%	19.8%	0.0%	23.5%	1.2%	23.5%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	0.0%	27.5%	0.0%	27.5%	2.5%	30.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	4.3%	10.6%	0.0%	12.8%	6.4%	17.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	1.6%	14.5%	3.2%	0.2	4.8%	19.4%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	1.0%	8.8%	1.0%	0.1	5.9%	14.7%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	4.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	3.1%	15.6%	3.1%	0.2	6.3%	21.9%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	3.5%	14.1%	0.0%	0.2	0.0%	17.6%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	7.5%	13.4%	7.5%	0.3	9.0%	28.4%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	8.0%	11.9%	4.5%	0.2	7.0%	24.4%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	8.8%	22.1%	4.4%	30.1%	6.6%	31.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	4.2%	12.0%	2.1%	17.6%	6.3%	20.4%

Table 20 cont. Veterans' Report of Public Financial Support at Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Service Connected for Psychiatry %	Service Connected for Other %	Non-Service Connected Pension %	Any VA Benefit %	Social Security Disability %	Any VA or Non-VA Disability %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	10.3%	27.6%	6.9%	34.5%	20.7%	44.8%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	5.7%	9.4%	1.9%	13.2%	1.9%	13.2%
11	550	Danville, IL	34	2.9%	11.8%	2.9%	14.7%	17.6%	26.5%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	2.2%	10.9%	2.2%	15.2%	6.5%	15.2%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	1.2%	19.8%	3.0%	23.4%	3.6%	22.8%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	2.6%	7.9%	13.2%	22.4%	18.4%	27.6%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	0.0%	20.0%	15.0%	35.0%	5.0%	25.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	2.9%	15.7%	11.4%	28.6%	7.1%	24.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	0.0%	18.0%	6.0%	20.0%	4.0%	22.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	1.5%	6.0%	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%	7.5%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	3.2%	9.7%	0.0%	12.9%	9.7%	19.4%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	0.0%	15.8%	1.7%	15.5%	6.9%	19.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	1.8%	14.3%	0.6%	16.1%	3.6%	19.6%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	4.9%	8.7%	8.2%	20.7%	1.6%	13.6%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	5.3%	5.3%	2.6%	13.2%	0.0%	10.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	0.8%	9.4%	0.0%	10.2%	0.0%	10.2%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	2.6%	17.9%	2.6%	23.1%	1.3%	20.5%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	3.8%	9.2%	7.3%	20.1%	4.5%	16.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	7.7%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	5.6%	8.1%	17.7%	28.2%	3.2%	16.9%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	8.3%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	13.9%	36.1%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	4.0%	10.9%	3.0%	17.5%	3.3%	18.5%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	3.1%	13.4%	7.2%	23.7%	9.3%	25.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	2.0%	12.2%	9.2%	22.4%	9.2%	22.4%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	1.8%	12.3%	1.8%	15.8%	1.8%	14.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	4.5%	9.1%	0.0%	13.6%	4.5%	18.2%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	4.8%	9.5%	0.0%	9.5%	4.8%	14.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	1.2%	6.2%	0.0%	7.4%	1.2%	8.6%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	13.9%	30.6%	2.8%	41.7%	8.3%	43.1%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	18.2%	27.3%
20	692	White City, OR	151	3.3%	9.3%	2.6%	14.6%	2.6%	14.6%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	20.0%	10.0%	15.0%	40.0%	15.0%	35.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	1.3%	6.7%	5.3%	13.3%	13.3%	24.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	41.7%	25.0%	33.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	15.7%	7.8%	19.6%	35.3%	15.7%	39.2%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	23.3%	16.7%	26.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	2.6%	15.6%	10.4%	26.0%	24.7%	50.6%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	10.3%	13.2%	8.8%	29.4%	22.1%	45.6%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	0.0%	15.6%	3.1%	18.8%	3.1%	18.8%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	0.0%	6.6%	1.3%	7.9%	7.9%	13.2%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	3.4%	10.3%	5.2%	19.0%	12.1%	24.1%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	4.8%	13.3%	5.5%	22.1%	15.1%	29.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**4.1%**	**12.2%**	**4.9%**	**20.0%**	**7.3%**	**21.6%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**4.4%**	**12.1%**	**4.9%**	**19.9%**	**8.0%**	**22.1%**
SITE S.D.				**4.5%**	**5.7%**	**5.2%**	**9.3%**	**7.4%**	**10.8%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 21. Income in the 30 Days Prior to Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Employment Income (month prior to admission) $	Mean Other Income†† (month prior to admission) $	Mean Total Income $
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	$4.80	$724.32	$729.12
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	$61.75	$328.13	$388.55
1	523	Boston, MA	35	$14.29	$361.46	$375.74
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	$23.52	$221.61	$244.93
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	$11.20	$247.38	$258.58
1	650	Providence, RI	70	$12.83	$664.31	$677.14
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	$11.98	$505.86	$517.69
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	$7.89	$302.39	$310.29
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	$0.00	$71.64	$71.64
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	$0.00	$25.84	$25.84
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	$58.70	$299.74	$358.44
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	$24.33	$332.92	$357.04
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	$30.39	$225.58	$255.98
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	$0.00	$247.64	$247.64
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	$6.26	$78.67	$84.94
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	$0.17	$48.12	$48.28
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	$0.00	$335.72	$335.72
3	632	Northport, NY	28	$44.50	$228.32	$272.82
4	529	Butler, PA	49	$8.98	$131.45	$140.43
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	$15.10	$93.69	$108.79
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	$0.00	$26.31	$26.31
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	$20.00	$189.81	$209.81
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	$18.40	$90.00	$108.40
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	$19.23	$268.32	$287.55
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	$17.23	$158.32	$175.40
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	$0.00	$141.61	$141.61
5	688	Washington, DC	83	$33.13	$178.02	$211.16
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	$73.65	$8.12	$81.76
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	$116.81	$211.81	$328.62
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	$227.18	$25.00	$252.18
6	658	Salem, VA	72	$51.32	$177.54	$228.86
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	$59.40	$101.68	$161.08
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	$45.29	$217.48	$262.77
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	$97.26	$98.52	$195.78
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	$58.57	$151.22	$209.80
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	$214.77	$165.05	$379.82
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	$0.00	$28.37	$28.37
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	$0.00	$181.84	$181.84
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	$58.03	$287.54	$345.57
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	$11.69	$121.60	$133.30
8	546	Miami, FL	40	$56.20	$149.10	$205.30
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	$9.57	$93.72	$103.30
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	$59.65	$119.50	17914.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	$0.00	$103.67	10366.7%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	$10.94	$18.92	2985.9%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	$53.13	$150.75	20387.5%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	$0.00	$33.15	3315.3%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	$11.94	$289.61	30155.2%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	$44.86	$239.40	28425.9%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	$10.50	$174.10	18459.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	$5.49	$114.86	$120.35

Table 21 cont. Income in the 30 Days Prior to Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Employment Income (month prior to admission) $	Mean Other Income†† (month prior to admission) $	Mean Total Income $
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	$41.72	$397.07	$438.79
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	$14.62	$132.72	$147.34
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	$54.18	$205.35	$259.53
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	$46.52	$201.24	$247.76
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	$6.23	$125.56	$131.79
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	$16.97	$336.26	$353.24
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	$15.75	$267.10	$282.85
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	$59.69	$187.46	$247.14
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	$11.00	$223.56	$234.56
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	$76.16	$32.63	$108.79
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	$0.00	$57.50	$57.50
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	$95.65	$116.19	$211.84
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	$23.28	$109.00	$132.28
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	$10.31	$81.00	$91.31
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	$25.93	$138.15	$164.09
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	$135.26	$42.45	$177.71
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	$27.03	$26.53	$53.56
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	$1.15	$141.88	$143.04
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	$41.51	$150.67	$192.18
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	$0.00	$25.97	$25.97
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	$93.97	$240.45	$334.42
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	$25.00	$210.61	$235.61
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	$91.18	$101.41	$192.59
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	$75.22	$306.40	$381.62
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	$19.39	$178.21	$197.60
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	$31.58	$62.35	$93.93
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	$0.00	$111.05	$111.05
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	$60.57	$191.86	$252.43
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	$88.23	$135.00	$223.23
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	$33.06	$493.97	$527.03
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	$86.82	$182.91	$269.73
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	$5.89	$87.85	$93.74
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	$60.50	$793.55	$854.05
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	$54.27	$205.81	$260.08
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	$77.08	$508.25	$585.33
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	$44.47	$697.63	$742.10
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	$137.90	$337.40	$475.30
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	$4.68	$515.57	$520.25
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	$43.60	$569.57	$613.18
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	$0.00	$37.82	$37.82
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	$84.69	$178.16	$262.84
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	$0.00	$109.66	$109.66
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	$6.03	$234.43	$240.47
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	$69.15	$259.36	$328.51
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**$36.04**	**$188.35**	**$224.34**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**$38.08**	**$205.66**	**$243.71**
SITE S.D.				**$42.47**	**$161.38**	**$166.89**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Mean other income includes service connected disability compensation, non-service connected pension, SSDI, SSI, Social Security Retirement, other disability (e.g. workman's compensation) and any other public support (e.g. food stamps, general relief).

Table 22. Usual Residence in Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Outdoors / Shelter %	Other %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	80.0%	0.0%	12.0%	8.0%	0.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	21.0%	7.7%	47.6%	21.4%	2.4%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	23.5%	17.6%	44.1%	14.7%	0.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	30.5%	6.8%	28.8%	32.2%	1.7%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	38.9%	6.5%	6.5%	44.4%	3.7%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	67.1%	15.7%	2.9%	10.0%	4.3%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	52.9%	18.8%	15.3%	12.9%	0.0%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	69.7%	15.8%	6.6%	6.6%	1.3%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	40.4%	4.3%	48.9%	6.4%	0.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	63.0%	13.0%	18.5%	5.6%	0.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	32.7%	17.7%	28.3%	17.7%	3.5%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	49.2%	16.7%	3.3%	25.8%	5.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	85.7%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	1.1%	0.0%	98.9%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	14.0%	4.1%	66.9%	10.7%	4.1%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	35.9%	5.1%	17.9%	39.7%	1.3%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	39.3%	7.1%	28.6%	21.4%	3.6%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	6.1%	0.0%	93.9%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	54.0%	1.4%	4.5%	38.4%	1.7%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	4.0%	4.0%	90.7%	0.0%	1.3%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	32.3%	5.6%	57.3%	4.0%	0.8%
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	70.0%	20.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	54.8%	38.7%	0.0%	3.2%	3.2%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	58.0%	0.9%	21.4%	19.6%	0.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	11.2%	1.7%	86.0%	1.1%	0.0%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	49.4%	21.7%	4.8%	22.9%	1.2%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	11.8%	2.0%	84.3%	2.0%	0.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	38.1%	14.3%	19.0%	28.6%	0.0%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	63.6%	9.1%	0.0%	22.7%	4.5%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	44.4%	5.6%	9.7%	40.3%	0.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	18.5%	70.5%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	35.4%	16.7%	20.8%	27.1%	0.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	26.1%	56.5%	0.0%	13.0%	4.3%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	16.3%	81.6%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	52.4%	15.5%	1.0%	29.1%	1.9%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	3.3%	0.0%	93.3%	3.3%	0.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	62.3%	1.4%	11.6%	24.6%	0.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	67.5%	10.4%	1.9%	18.8%	1.3%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	21.3%	5.0%	71.3%	2.5%	0.0%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	30.0%	17.5%	20.0%	32.5%	0.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	10.6%	83.0%	2.1%	4.3%	0.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	51.6%	9.7%	11.3%	25.8%	1.6%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	20.6%	52.9%	1.0%	25.5%	0.0%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	39.1%	14.1%	0.0%	45.3%	1.6%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	18.8%	56.3%	6.3%	18.8%	0.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	61.2%	13.4%	1.5%	22.4%	1.5%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	53.7%	5.5%	15.4%	17.9%	7.5%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	44.9%	11.8%	33.8%	9.6%	0.0%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	26.1%	3.5%	57.0%	13.4%	0.0%
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	65.5%	10.3%	3.4%	17.2%	3.4%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	47.2%	1.9%	20.8%	30.2%	0.0%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	55.9%	0.0%	0.0%	44.1%	0.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	37.0%	45.7%	0.0%	17.4%	0.0%

Table 22 cont. Usual Residence in Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Outdoors / Shelter %	Other %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	18.6%	11.4%	68.3%	1.8%	0.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	63.2%	22.4%	3.9%	10.5%	0.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	35.0%	60.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	15.7%	51.4%	27.1%	5.7%	0.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	28.0%	6.0%	60.0%	6.0%	0.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	25.4%	13.4%	44.8%	16.4%	0.0%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	57.1%	7.1%	14.3%	7.1%	14.3%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	51.6%	3.2%	32.3%	12.9%	0.0%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	15.5%	0.0%	81.0%	3.4%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	33.9%	3.0%	33.9%	29.2%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	43.5%	31.5%	0.5%	22.8%	1.6%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	34.2%	21.1%	2.6%	42.1%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	8.6%	7.0%	83.6%	0.8%	0.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	29.5%	44.9%	11.5%	12.8%	1.3%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	32.5%	10.0%	9.5%	45.5%	2.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	2.6%	0.0%	97.4%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	27.4%	9.7%	0.8%	62.1%	0.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	63.9%	33.3%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	27.1%	9.9%	38.9%	22.1%	2.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	63.9%	15.5%	1.0%	18.6%	1.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	11.2%	10.2%	77.6%	1.0%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	19.3%	78.9%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	68.2%	13.6%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	23.8%	9.5%	61.9%	4.8%	0.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	33.3%	30.9%	12.3%	23.5%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	55.6%	5.6%	19.4%	19.4%	0.0%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	72.7%	0.0%	9.1%	18.2%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	151	3.3%	0.0%	96.7%	0.0%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	18.7%	12.0%	44.0%	25.3%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	52.9%	31.4%	0.0%	15.7%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	50.0%	40.0%	3.3%	6.7%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	41.6%	35.1%	0.0%	19.5%	3.9%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	61.8%	36.8%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	36.4%	36.4%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	46.9%	21.9%	21.9%	9.4%	0.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	3.9%	0.0%	93.4%	1.3%	1.3%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	43.1%	48.3%	3.4%	5.2%	0.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	61.6%	6.3%	12.9%	17.3%	1.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**34.6%**	**14.7%**	**31.4%**	**18.1%**	**1.2%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**37.2%**	**18.2%**	**28.7%**	**14.8%**	**1.0%**
SITE S.D.				**21.1%**	**20.0%**	**32.3%**	**13.3%**	**2.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Includes own apartment, room or house; apartment, room or house of friend or family member and hotel or SRO.

Table 23. Homeless When Last in Community and History of Job Loss Due to Substance Use by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Homeless When Last Living in the Community %	Any Job Lost Due to Substance Abuse %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	28.0%	40.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	71.0%	56.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	65.7%	71.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	74.6%	74.6%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	78.7%	61.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	44.3%	35.7%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	27.1%	38.8%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	44.7%	52.6%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	40.4%	57.4%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	79.7%	82.6%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	37.0%	51.9%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	61.1%	61.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	45.0%	40.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	21.4%	42.9%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	99.6%	63.9%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	44.6%	63.6%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	69.2%	48.7%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	85.7%	64.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	53.1%	73.5%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	82.7%	59.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	54.7%	66.7%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	58.1%	45.2%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	40.0%	70.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	41.9%	71.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	58.0%	59.8%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	81.5%	51.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	38.6%	42.2%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	66.7%	54.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	42.9%	76.2%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	54.5%	54.5%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	65.3%	59.7%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	90.8%	65.9%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	61.5%	54.2%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	73.9%	60.9%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	51.0%	69.4%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	89.3%	33.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	100.0%	66.7%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	65.2%	36.2%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	53.9%	42.2%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	61.7%	44.2%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	55.0%	42.5%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	2.1%	38.3%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	56.5%	69.4%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	74.5%	37.3%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	98.4%	71.9%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	68.8%	59.4%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	60.0%	68.2%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	77.6%	94.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	72.6%	73.5%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	55.1%	80.1%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	72.5%	50.7%

Table 23 cont. Homeless When Last in Community and History of Job Loss Due to Substance Use by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Homeless When Last Living in the Community %	Any Job Lost Due to Substance Abuse %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	44.8%	44.8%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	58.5%	75.5%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	64.7%	50.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	47.8%	65.2%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	62.3%	62.3%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	59.2%	36.8%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	40.0%	75.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	44.3%	60.0%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	60.0%	72.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	64.2%	85.1%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	64.3%	64.3%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	54.8%	77.4%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	51.7%	89.7%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	82.7%	50.6%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	45.1%	41.8%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	68.4%	62.2%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	35.9%	64.1%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	78.2%	64.1%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	69.7%	71.8%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	61.5%	69.2%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	79.0%	41.1%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	33.3%	36.1%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	77.2%	36.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	52.6%	64.9%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	59.2%	44.9%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	56.1%	87.7%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	40.9%	45.5%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	81.0%	66.7%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	53.1%	50.6%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	48.6%	41.7%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	90.9%	36.4%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	70.9%	51.0%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	40.0%	50.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	70.7%	61.3%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	33.3%	8.3%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	47.1%	66.7%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	43.3%	53.3%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	63.6%	71.4%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	30.9%	36.8%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	36.4%	63.6%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	21.9%	68.8%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	82.9%	63.2%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	69.0%	55.2%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	47.2%	66.1%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**63.9%**	**57.8%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**58.8%**	**57.9%**
SITE S.D.				**18.6%**	**15.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04:   VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 24. Clinical Psychiatric Diagnoses at Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Abuse / Dependency %	Drug Abuse/ Dependency %	Any Substance Abuse / Dependency %	Serious Mental Illness †† %	Dually Diagnosed ††† %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	48.0%	20.0%	52.0%	84.0%	48.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	77.4%	42.3%	83.5%	75.8%	62.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	82.9%	68.6%	88.6%	71.4%	62.9%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	86.4%	69.5%	94.9%	55.1%	50.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	82.4%	51.9%	88.9%	58.3%	52.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	42.9%	28.6%	52.9%	78.6%	41.4%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	57.6%	42.4%	67.1%	78.8%	45.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	69.7%	55.3%	73.7%	51.3%	35.5%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	70.2%	61.7%	78.7%	63.8%	46.8%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	91.3%	72.5%	100.0%	53.6%	53.6%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	61.1%	50.0%	75.9%	55.6%	42.6%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	72.6%	65.5%	82.3%	66.4%	55.8%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	54.2%	73.3%	83.3%	40.8%	35.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	64.3%	71.4%	92.9%	57.1%	50.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	73.6%	76.6%	97.0%	40.9%	37.9%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	81.8%	72.7%	95.9%	41.3%	39.7%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	70.5%	65.4%	84.6%	59.0%	44.9%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	75.0%	57.1%	92.9%	50.0%	46.4%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	87.8%	67.3%	100.0%	55.1%	55.1%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	73.7%	71.6%	93.1%	**34.3%**	31.1%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	80.0%	80.0%	100.0%	**30.7%**	30.7%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	63.7%	58.9%	86.3%	42.7%	32.3%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	80.0%	80.0%	100.0%	40.0%	40.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	61.3%	77.4%	87.1%	45.2%	35.5%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	58.9%	71.4%	86.6%	57.1%	44.6%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	70.2%	68.0%	84.3%	56.2%	43.8%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	41.0%	62.7%	75.9%	49.4%	34.9%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	82.4%	70.6%	94.1%	**27.5%**	23.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	81.0%	52.4%	90.5%	42.9%	38.1%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	54.5%	81.8%	95.5%	45.5%	40.9%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	84.7%	51.4%	91.7%	**31.9%**	26.4%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	83.2%	78.0%	98.3%	38.2%	36.4%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	74.0%	70.8%	91.7%	66.7%	61.5%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	60.9%	69.6%	95.7%	**30.4%**	30.4%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	93.9%	69.4%	95.9%	46.9%	42.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	51.5%	58.3%	71.8%	40.8%	26.2%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	76.7%	63.3%	86.7%	**20.0%**	20.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	69.6%	73.9%	85.5%	47.8%	39.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	70.1%	61.7%	85.7%	56.5%	44.2%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	67.9%	50.6%	75.3%	37.0%	28.4%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	72.5%	60.0%	87.5%	75.0%	65.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	76.6%	55.3%	85.1%	44.7%	38.3%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	80.6%	75.8%	88.7%	54.8%	45.2%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	82.4%	62.7%	89.2%	**21.6%**	14.7%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	76.6%	78.1%	93.8%	**7.8%**	3.1%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	68.8%	75.0%	96.9%	**15.6%**	15.6%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	88.2%	62.4%	89.4%	52.9%	45.9%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	94.0%	73.1%	94.0%	53.7%	49.3%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	79.6%	68.2%	84.1%	47.8%	37.3%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	86.8%	85.3%	91.2%	50.0%	45.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	78.2%	74.6%	91.5%	50.0%	43.0%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	48.3%	51.7%	65.5%	75.9%	44.8%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	69.8%	71.7%	92.5%	71.7%	67.9%
11	550	Danville, IL	34	76.5%	61.8%	88.2%	38.2%	35.3%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	67.4%	41.3%	76.1%	54.3%	34.8%

Table 24 cont. Clinical Psychiatric Diagnoses at Admission by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Abuse / Dependency %	Drug Abuse/ Dependency %	Any Substance Abuse / Dependency %	Serious Mental Illness †† %	Dually Diagnosed ††† %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	71.9%	82.0%	95.2%	36.5%	32.3%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	50.0%	47.4%	72.4%	44.7%	23.7%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	85.0%	40.0%	90.0%	75.0%	65.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	82.9%	52.9%	85.7%	70.0%	60.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	82.0%	66.0%	92.0%	62.0%	56.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	88.1%	80.6%	97.0%	55.2%	53.7%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	71.4%	50.0%	78.6%	64.3%	42.9%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	74.2%	41.9%	87.1%	41.9%	38.7%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	93.1%	89.7%	93.1%	94.8%	87.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	69.0%	53.0%	83.3%	50.6%	41.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	59.8%	73.4%	88.0%	41.3%	30.4%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	71.1%	65.8%	86.8%	**34.2%**	28.9%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	90.6%	88.3%	93.8%	**23.4%**	20.3%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	82.1%	48.7%	89.7%	60.3%	52.6%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	81.3%	80.1%	89.8%	53.1%	45.0%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	79.5%	66.7%	97.4%	48.7%	48.7%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	74.2%	66.9%	87.9%	68.5%	58.9%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	47.2%	38.9%	72.2%	41.7%	22.2%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	65.2%	42.4%	71.9%	57.4%	40.3%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	67.0%	35.1%	82.5%	74.2%	60.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	69.4%	42.9%	79.6%	61.2%	45.9%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	82.5%	63.2%	91.2%	49.1%	43.9%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	63.6%	31.8%	68.2%	72.7%	45.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	71.4%	71.4%	95.2%	52.4%	47.6%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	64.2%	38.3%	70.4%	53.1%	40.7%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	40.3%	41.7%	55.6%	75.0%	41.7%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	54.5%	27.3%	54.5%	36.4%	9.1%
20	692	White City, OR	151	77.5%	60.3%	90.1%	56.3%	49.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	70.0%	60.0%	85.0%	55.0%	45.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	66.7%	72.0%	85.3%	**36.0%**	29.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	50.0%	25.0%	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	56.9%	70.6%	86.3%	66.7%	56.9%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	53.3%	53.3%	76.7%	46.7%	36.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	76.6%	76.6%	97.4%	45.5%	42.9%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	51.5%	39.7%	60.3%	64.7%	39.7%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	54.5%	63.6%	72.7%	72.7%	45.5%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	87.5%	28.1%	90.6%	59.4%	53.1%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	93.4%	40.8%	96.1%	59.2%	56.6%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	81.0%	43.1%	89.7%	46.6%	36.2%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	87.1%	57.6%	95.2%	49.1%	46.9%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				73.0%	63.0%	87.0%	51.0%	42.0%
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				72.0%	60.7%	85.6%	51.9%	42.1%
SITE S.D.				13.0%	15.7%	11.0%	15.6%	13.2%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories: schizophrenia, other psychotic disorder, affective disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD and other anxiety disorders.

††† Dual Diagnosis is defined as having both a substance abuse disorder and a serious psychiatric disorder.

Table 25. Presence of a Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Psychiatric Disorder†† %	Any Disabling Medical Condition %	Any Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	88.0%	80.0%	100.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	97.6%	50.4%	100.0%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	97.1%	54.3%	100.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	100.0%	54.2%	100.0%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	98.1%	58.3%	99.1%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	94.3%	82.9%	100.0%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	100.0%	45.9%	100.0%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	93.4%	77.6%	100.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	97.9%	51.1%	97.9%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	100.0%	59.4%	100.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	92.6%	74.1%	100.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	93.8%	67.3%	98.2%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	98.3%	42.5%	100.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	100.0%	28.6%	100.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	100.0%	29.7%	100.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	99.2%	37.2%	100.0%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	98.7%	32.1%	98.7%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	100.0%	60.7%	100.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	100.0%	69.4%	100.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	100.0%	41.2%	100.0%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	100.0%	21.3%	100.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	96.8%	68.5%	100.0%
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	100.0%	54.8%	100.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	100.0%	37.5%	100.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	98.9%	76.4%	100.0%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	92.8%	48.2%	98.8%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	98.0%	58.8%	100.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	95.2%	42.9%	100.0%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	100.0%	86.4%	100.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	98.6%	44.4%	100.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	100.0%	62.4%	100.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	96.9%	77.1%	99.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	95.7%	43.5%	100.0%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	100.0%	67.3%	100.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	99.0%	73.8%	100.0%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	93.3%	66.7%	100.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	100.0%	55.1%	100.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	98.7%	59.1%	100.0%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	84.0%	74.1%	96.3%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	97.5%	92.5%	100.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	93.6%	70.2%	97.9%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	98.4%	32.3%	100.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	98.0%	58.8%	100.0%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	100.0%	14.1%	100.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	96.9%	40.6%	100.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	96.5%	64.7%	100.0%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	98.5%	83.6%	100.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	97.0%	54.2%	100.0%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	95.6%	66.9%	100.0%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	100.0%	32.4%	100.0%

Table 25 cont. Presence of a Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Psychiatric Disorder†† %	Any Disabling Medical Condition %	Any Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	100.0%	69.0%	100.0%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	98.1%	69.8%	100.0%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	91.2%	35.3%	97.1%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	95.7%	73.9%	100.0%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	99.4%	65.3%	100.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	97.4%	65.8%	100.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	100.0%	65.0%	100.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	95.7%	78.6%	100.0%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	98.0%	56.0%	100.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	98.5%	23.9%	100.0%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	100.0%	64.3%	100.0%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	93.5%	38.7%	100.0%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	100.0%	77.6%	100.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	93.5%	37.5%	98.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	99.5%	72.8%	100.0%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	94.7%	68.4%	97.4%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	98.4%	10.9%	99.2%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	97.4%	64.1%	98.7%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	98.3%	71.6%	99.8%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	97.4%	76.9%	100.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	97.6%	64.5%	99.2%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	100.0%	52.8%	100.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	93.1%	76.2%	99.7%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	95.9%	56.7%	99.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	94.9%	91.8%	100.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	96.5%	63.2%	100.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	100.0%	31.8%	100.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	86.4%	63.0%	100.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	91.7%	80.6%	100.0%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	81.8%	90.9%	100.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	98.0%	69.5%	99.3%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	95.0%	40.0%	100.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	96.0%	63.5%	100.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	91.7%	75.0%	100.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	100.0%	64.7%	100.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	96.7%	20.0%	100.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	100.0%	54.5%	100.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	89.7%	79.4%	100.0%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	100.0%	63.6%	100.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	96.9%	43.8%	100.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	100.0%	97.4%	100.0%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	100.0%	46.6%	100.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	97.8%	52.8%	100.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**97.3%**	**58.1%**	**99.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				**97.0%**	**58.6%**	**99.7%**
SITE S.D.				**3.6%**	**18.3%**	**0.7%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso+A41; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Includes substance abuse disorders.

Table 26. Self-Reported Lifetime Hospitalizations for Mental Health Problems by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Ever Hospitalized for Alcohol Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Drug Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Psychiatric Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Any Mental Health Problem %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	52.0%	20.0%	52.0%	72.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	67.7%	32.7%	45.2%	85.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	74.3%	60.0%	45.7%	94.3%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	83.8%	65.0%	41.9%	95.7%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	81.5%	55.6%	50.0%	91.7%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	42.9%	30.0%	78.6%	88.6%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	60.0%	44.7%	61.2%	90.6%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	72.4%	56.6%	35.5%	80.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	76.6%	68.1%	40.4%	91.5%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	82.6%	59.4%	42.0%	92.8%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	46.3%	46.3%	33.3%	68.5%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	78.8%	68.1%	57.5%	93.8%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	41.7%	52.5%	17.5%	65.8%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	57.1%	64.3%	50.0%	92.9%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	56.9%	57.2%	37.9%	75.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	80.2%	71.1%	24.0%	92.6%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	66.7%	66.7%	55.1%	78.2%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	60.7%	46.4%	46.4%	85.7%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	51.0%	38.8%	28.6%	67.3%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	55.4%	66.3%	24.2%	84.1%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	78.7%	74.7%	32.0%	97.3%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	62.1%	55.6%	46.8%	88.7%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	70.0%	70.0%	40.0%	100.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	48.4%	64.5%	45.2%	87.1%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	67.9%	69.6%	53.6%	96.4%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	71.9%	67.4%	37.1%	90.4%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	30.1%	39.8%	31.3%	61.4%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	84.3%	84.3%	23.5%	96.1%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	85.7%	57.1%	52.4%	100.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	36.4%	59.1%	40.9%	81.8%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	84.7%	47.2%	31.9%	98.6%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	48.6%	47.4%	28.9%	64.7%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	68.8%	65.6%	49.0%	89.6%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	43.5%	39.1%	21.7%	65.2%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	44.9%	34.7%	38.8%	67.3%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	26.2%	34.0%	29.1%	57.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	73.3%	66.7%	20.0%	83.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	60.9%	63.8%	47.8%	78.3%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	76.6%	64.3%	61.7%	94.8%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	64.2%	46.9%	30.9%	79.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	55.0%	47.5%	37.5%	72.5%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	55.3%	34.0%	27.7%	70.2%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	79.0%	67.7%	37.1%	91.9%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	29.4%	15.7%	8.8%	35.3%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	31.3%	31.3%	15.6%	48.4%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	68.8%	71.9%	25.0%	93.8%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	75.3%	55.3%	43.5%	82.4%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	83.6%	67.2%	64.2%	89.6%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	67.2%	58.7%	41.3%	82.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	83.8%	81.6%	38.2%	89.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	81.7%	73.2%	50.7%	97.2%

Table 26 cont. Self-Reported Lifetime Hospitalizations for Mental Health Problems by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Ever Hospitalized for Alcohol Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Drug Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Psychiatric Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Any Mental Health Problem %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	58.6%	48.3%	65.5%	86.2%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	64.2%	71.7%	35.8%	86.8%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	61.8%	47.1%	38.2%	70.6%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	47.8%	30.4%	34.8%	65.2%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	71.9%	82.6%	40.1%	99.4%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	53.9%	47.4%	44.7%	82.9%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	80.0%	30.0%	55.0%	90.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	77.1%	44.3%	52.9%	88.6%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	76.0%	60.0%	34.0%	90.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	83.6%	77.6%	52.2%	98.5%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	78.6%	50.0%	57.1%	85.7%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	80.6%	54.8%	64.5%	93.5%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	93.1%	87.9%	60.3%	94.8%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	58.9%	45.8%	35.1%	81.5%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	37.5%	47.8%	24.5%	66.8%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	63.2%	65.8%	34.2%	78.9%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	89.8%	82.0%	18.8%	95.3%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	70.5%	43.6%	39.7%	85.9%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	62.8%	60.4%	32.9%	70.6%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	59.0%	46.2%	33.3%	66.7%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	34.7%	36.3%	30.6%	57.3%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	44.4%	36.1%	55.6%	83.3%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	60.1%	45.2%	34.3%	76.6%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	42.3%	20.6%	32.0%	60.8%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	69.4%	44.9%	63.3%	90.8%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	82.5%	61.4%	38.6%	96.5%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	45.5%	18.2%	18.2%	54.5%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	81.0%	71.4%	38.1%	100.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	48.1%	29.6%	33.3%	64.2%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	47.2%	36.1%	41.7%	68.1%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	72.7%	18.2%	9.1%	81.8%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	74.2%	55.0%	49.7%	90.1%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	30.0%	30.0%	45.0%	55.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	66.7%	73.3%	34.7%	93.3%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	33.3%	25.0%	33.3%	66.7%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	43.1%	54.9%	47.1%	80.4%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	56.7%	46.7%	46.7%	76.7%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	49.4%	49.4%	27.3%	68.8%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	41.2%	36.8%	45.6%	66.2%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	54.5%	63.6%	72.7%	90.9%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	78.1%	18.8%	28.1%	84.4%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	96.1%	40.8%	53.9%	97.4%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	69.0%	43.1%	44.8%	93.1%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	87.5%	60.1%	44.6%	97.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**64.0%**	**54.5%**	**39.2%**	**81.9%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**63.2%**	**52.3%**	**40.4%**	**82.0%**
SITE S.D.				**16.8%**	**16.9%**	**13.5%**	**13.6%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 27. Self-Reported Legal History by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Never Been Arrested %	Arrested 1 Time %	Arrested 2-5 Times %	Arrested 6-10 Times %	Arrested More Than 10 Times %	Never Been in Jail/Prison %	Jail/Prison < 2 Weeks %	Jail/Prison 2 Weeks or More %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	52.0%	8.0%	20.0%	12.0%	8.0%	64.0%	8.0%	28.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	21.9%	15.3%	32.6%	12.0%	18.2%	47.9%	10.3%	41.7%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	17.6%	14.7%	14.7%	17.6%	35.3%	35.3%	2.9%	61.8%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	22.2%	17.9%	40.2%	8.5%	11.1%	41.5%	14.4%	44.1%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	26.9%	13.9%	37.0%	8.3%	13.9%	52.8%	13.0%	34.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	41.2%	16.2%	30.9%	2.9%	8.8%	52.9%	19.1%	27.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	28.2%	15.3%	44.7%	5.9%	5.9%	54.1%	17.6%	28.2%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	26.7%	21.3%	33.3%	8.0%	10.7%	42.7%	16.0%	41.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	34.0%	10.6%	44.7%	8.5%	2.1%	51.1%	14.9%	34.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	31.9%	23.2%	31.9%	7.2%	5.8%	43.5%	17.4%	39.1%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	37.0%	27.8%	24.1%	3.7%	7.4%	51.9%	20.4%	27.8%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	22.1%	20.4%	43.4%	5.3%	8.8%	38.1%	14.2%	47.8%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	27.5%	10.8%	44.2%	10.0%	7.5%	50.0%	8.3%	41.7%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	28.6%	21.4%	35.7%	7.1%	7.1%	35.7%	14.3%	50.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	16.0%	19.3%	37.9%	10.4%	16.4%	23.7%	21.1%	55.3%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	25.6%	14.9%	38.0%	9.1%	12.4%	41.3%	8.3%	50.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	29.5%	17.9%	38.5%	6.4%	7.7%	59.0%	10.3%	30.8%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	18.5%	22.2%	44.4%	14.8%	0.0%	40.7%	25.9%	33.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	18.4%	24.5%	46.9%	8.2%	2.0%	38.8%	10.2%	51.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	27.3%	27.3%	35.3%	8.0%	2.1%	39.8%	17.3%	42.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	14.7%	21.3%	42.7%	14.7%	6.7%	30.7%	9.3%	60.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	19.4%	21.0%	37.9%	9.7%	12.1%	42.7%	8.1%	49.2%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	0.0%	20.0%	30.0%	20.0%	50.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	9.7%	16.1%	71.0%	0.0%	3.2%	41.9%	12.9%	45.2%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	15.2%	24.1%	40.2%	11.6%	8.9%	27.7%	26.8%	45.5%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	19.1%	20.2%	42.7%	10.1%	7.9%	29.8%	18.5%	51.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	36.1%	21.7%	38.6%	2.4%	1.2%	50.6%	13.3%	36.1%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	11.8%	19.6%	56.9%	11.8%	0.0%	23.5%	23.5%	52.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	9.5%	14.3%	47.6%	19.0%	9.5%	19.0%	23.8%	57.1%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	22.7%	13.6%	40.9%	13.6%	9.1%	36.4%	0.0%	63.6%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	27.8%	15.3%	45.8%	5.6%	5.6%	27.8%	41.7%	30.6%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	5.8%	10.5%	51.2%	16.3%	16.3%	11.6%	14.5%	74.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	18.8%	6.3%	54.2%	12.5%	8.3%	31.3%	11.5%	57.3%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	8.7%	8.7%	65.2%	8.7%	8.7%	26.1%	26.1%	47.8%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	6.1%	12.2%	53.1%	18.4%	10.2%	10.2%	28.6%	61.2%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	17.5%	18.4%	46.6%	12.6%	4.9%	27.2%	23.3%	49.5%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	10.0%	10.0%	46.7%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	23.3%	60.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	24.6%	17.4%	46.4%	8.7%	2.9%	37.7%	24.6%	37.7%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	9.1%	21.4%	48.7%	11.0%	9.7%	32.5%	27.3%	40.3%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	26.3%	17.5%	37.5%	12.5%	6.3%	42.5%	12.5%	45.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	10.0%	17.5%	50.0%	10.0%	12.5%	15.0%	30.0%	55.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	17.0%	8.5%	38.3%	21.3%	14.9%	40.4%	14.9%	44.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	16.1%	19.4%	46.8%	8.1%	9.7%	22.6%	25.8%	51.6%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	21.6%	14.7%	50.0%	6.9%	6.9%	31.4%	15.7%	52.9%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	32.8%	10.9%	37.5%	14.1%	4.7%	37.5%	15.6%	46.9%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	31.3%	12.5%	46.9%	0.0%	9.4%	37.5%	12.5%	50.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	42.4%	11.8%	38.8%	2.4%	4.7%	47.1%	23.5%	29.4%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	11.9%	19.4%	47.8%	11.9%	9.0%	11.9%	34.3%	53.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	13.4%	17.9%	41.8%	9.0%	17.9%	20.4%	24.9%	54.7%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	10.3%	11.8%	47.1%	16.2%	14.7%	18.4%	19.1%	62.5%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	9.9%	12.7%	48.6%	11.3%	17.6%	16.9%	16.9%	66.2%

Table 27. Self-Reported Legal History by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Never Been Arrested %	Arrested 1 Time %	Arrested 2-5 Times %	Arrested 6-10 Times %	Arrested More Than 10 Times %	Never Been in Jail/Prison %	Jail/Prison < 2 Weeks %	Jail/Prison 2 Weeks or More %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	32.1%	7.1%	46.4%	7.1%	7.1%	37.9%	27.6%	34.5%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	7.5%	28.3%	49.1%	7.5%	7.5%	17.0%	20.8%	62.3%
11	550	Danville, IL	34	2.9%	14.7%	61.8%	11.8%	8.8%	14.7%	38.2%	47.1%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	13.3%	15.6%	42.2%	13.3%	15.6%	19.6%	26.1%	54.3%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	9.6%	9.0%	53.3%	18.6%	9.6%	53.3%	9.0%	37.7%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	26.0%	15.1%	45.2%	4.1%	9.6%	46.6%	15.1%	38.4%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	5.0%	25.0%	35.0%	10.0%	25.0%	25.0%	15.0%	60.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	8.6%	17.1%	37.1%	17.1%	20.0%	15.7%	14.3%	70.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	6.1%	22.4%	44.9%	14.3%	12.2%	18.4%	36.7%	44.9%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	6.0%	13.4%	47.8%	22.4%	10.4%	11.9%	28.4%	59.7%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	14.3%	21.4%	42.9%	21.4%	0.0%	35.7%	14.3%	50.0%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	10.0%	20.0%	36.7%	13.3%	20.0%	22.6%	32.3%	45.2%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	17.2%	13.8%	43.1%	15.5%	10.3%	48.3%	1.7%	50.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	14.3%	20.2%	47.6%	12.5%	5.4%	24.4%	25.6%	50.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	14.7%	20.1%	51.6%	7.6%	6.0%	20.1%	12.0%	67.9%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	10.5%	13.2%	65.8%	7.9%	2.6%	15.8%	44.7%	39.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	12.5%	19.5%	47.7%	10.2%	10.2%	14.1%	37.5%	48.4%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	11.5%	15.4%	37.2%	16.7%	19.2%	21.8%	16.7%	61.5%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	9.5%	12.1%	48.9%	13.3%	16.2%	12.4%	14.0%	73.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	15.4%	2.6%	30.8%	33.3%	17.9%	30.8%	12.8%	56.4%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	22.6%	12.1%	43.5%	11.3%	10.5%	24.4%	16.3%	59.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	27.8%	11.1%	41.7%	11.1%	8.3%	41.7%	22.2%	36.1%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	18.5%	12.2%	48.2%	7.6%	13.5%	24.8%	21.1%	54.1%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	16.5%	16.5%	40.2%	17.5%	9.3%	25.8%	24.7%	49.5%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	20.4%	13.3%	41.8%	6.1%	18.4%	20.4%	19.4%	60.2%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	21.1%	14.0%	49.1%	5.3%	10.5%	26.3%	10.5%	63.2%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	9.1%	27.3%	40.9%	9.1%	13.6%	22.7%	31.8%	45.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	4.8%	4.8%	38.1%	28.6%	23.8%	4.8%	4.8%	90.5%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	17.3%	19.8%	38.3%	14.8%	9.9%	32.1%	21.0%	46.9%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	37.5%	18.1%	29.2%	9.7%	5.6%	47.2%	16.7%	36.1%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	0.0%	36.4%	54.5%	0.0%	9.1%	18.2%	9.1%	72.7%
20	692	White City, OR	151	14.6%	19.9%	37.1%	9.9%	18.5%	23.2%	23.8%	53.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	10.0%	30.0%	45.0%	10.0%	5.0%	20.0%	15.0%	65.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	8.0%	16.0%	34.7%	21.3%	20.0%	10.7%	18.7%	70.7%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	16.7%	16.7%	41.7%	16.7%	8.3%	41.7%	16.7%	41.7%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	11.8%	21.6%	31.4%	13.7%	21.6%	13.7%	37.3%	49.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	20.0%	16.7%	33.3%	6.7%	23.3%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	11.7%	11.7%	37.7%	16.9%	22.1%	16.9%	22.1%	61.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	25.4%	17.9%	43.3%	7.5%	6.0%	32.8%	22.4%	44.8%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	36.4%	18.2%	36.4%	9.1%	0.0%	36.4%	27.3%	36.4%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	15.6%	9.4%	40.6%	18.8%	15.6%	18.8%	43.8%	37.5%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	12.0%	8.0%	36.0%	21.3%	22.7%	19.7%	26.3%	53.9%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	19.0%	17.2%	50.0%	8.6%	5.2%	29.3%	20.7%	50.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	19.2%	9.2%	44.6%	15.5%	11.4%	22.5%	22.5%	55.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**18.3%**	**16.3%**	**43.0%**	**11.2%**	**11.3%**	**29.9%**	**18.9%**	**51.2%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**18.6%**	**16.6%**	**42.7%**	**11.3%**	**10.8%**	**30.5%**	**19.6%**	**49.9%**
SITE S.D.				**9.8%**	**5.8%**	**8.7%**	**5.8%**	**6.5%**	**13.1%**	**9.0%**	**11.9%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 28. Type of Discharge from CWT/VI by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge %	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements %	Left Before Planned Discharge %	Other†† %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	36.7%	14.5%	43.5%	5.2%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	51.4%	**37.1%**	8.6%	2.9%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	72.9%	14.4%	9.3%	3.4%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	55.6%	**28.7%**	12.0%	3.7%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	**25.7%**	**32.9%**	30.0%	11.4%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	78.8%	0.0%	7.1%	14.1%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	52.6%	19.7%	19.7%	7.9%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	66.0%	14.9%	8.5%	10.6%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	89.9%	7.2%	1.4%	1.4%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	75.9%	22.2%	1.9%	0.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	48.7%	23.0%	24.8%	3.5%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	58.3%	21.7%	9.2%	10.8%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	**35.7%**	**28.6%**	14.3%	21.4%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	96.7%	2.6%	0.7%	0.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	56.2%	14.9%	25.6%	3.3%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	44.9%	28.2%	19.2%	7.7%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	46.4%	**35.7%**	17.9%	0.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	71.4%	16.3%	12.2%	0.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	44.3%	5.2%	47.4%	3.1%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	64.0%	17.3%	14.7%	4.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	38.7%	8.1%	44.4%	8.9%
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	70.0%	20.0%	10.0%	0.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	67.7%	3.2%	19.4%	9.7%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	74.1%	8.0%	13.4%	4.5%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	64.0%	8.4%	21.3%	6.2%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	49.4%	27.7%	19.3%	3.6%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	66.7%	21.6%	7.8%	3.9%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	**33.3%**	23.8%	33.3%	9.5%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	59.1%	18.2%	18.2%	4.5%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	70.8%	15.3%	8.3%	5.6%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	53.2%	22.5%	21.4%	2.9%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	43.8%	**31.3%**	15.6%	9.4%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	56.5%	17.4%	13.0%	13.0%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	42.9%	**28.6%**	16.3%	12.2%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	**24.3%**	**46.6%**	23.3%	5.8%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	53.3%	**33.3%**	10.0%	3.3%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	73.9%	10.1%	15.9%	0.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	64.9%	13.6%	9.7%	11.7%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	63.0%	8.6%	17.3%	11.1%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	87.5%	2.5%	7.5%	2.5%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	72.3%	14.9%	8.5%	4.3%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	71.0%	12.9%	9.7%	6.5%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	61.8%	6.9%	30.4%	1.0%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	76.6%	18.8%	0.0%	4.7%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	50.0%	**37.5%**	12.5%	0.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	51.8%	**30.6%**	14.1%	3.5%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	**28.4%**	**32.8%**	35.8%	3.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	66.7%	7.5%	20.4%	5.5%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	47.8%	26.5%	21.3%	4.4%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	40.8%	24.6%	14.8%	19.7%

Table 28 cont. Type of Discharge from CWT/VI by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge %	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements %	Left Before Planned Discharge %	Other†† %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	**17.2%**	6.9%	75.9%	0.0%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	58.5%	17.0%	20.8%	3.8%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	**35.3%**	**32.4%**	20.6%	11.8%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	63.0%	13.0%	17.4%	6.5%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	78.4%	13.2%	8.4%	0.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	68.4%	6.6%	13.2%	11.8%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	**35.0%**	**40.0%**	25.0%	0.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	**35.7%**	21.4%	35.7%	7.1%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	**30.0%**	**50.0%**	16.0%	4.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	41.8%	23.9%	23.9%	10.4%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	50.0%	21.4%	21.4%	7.1%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	**32.3%**	**32.3%**	25.8%	9.7%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	63.8%	22.4%	3.4%	10.3%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	44.0%	3.0%	45.2%	7.7%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	42.9%	19.0%	25.5%	12.5%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	73.7%	5.3%	21.1%	0.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	49.2%	23.4%	26.6%	0.8%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	**24.4%**	21.8%	46.2%	7.7%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	**31.8%**	24.2%	42.4%	1.7%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	71.8%	12.8%	7.7%	7.7%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	46.8%	8.9%	41.1%	3.2%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	38.9%	8.3%	50.0%	2.8%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	48.5%	25.7%	20.8%	5.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	41.2%	10.3%	45.4%	3.1%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	71.4%	10.2%	10.2%	8.2%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	**29.8%**	17.5%	36.8%	15.8%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	72.7%	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	42.9%	**28.6%**	19.0%	9.5%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	58.0%	27.2%	9.9%	4.9%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	63.9%	15.3%	15.3%	5.6%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	72.7%	9.1%	18.2%	0.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	57.0%	8.6%	23.8%	10.6%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	**35.0%**	25.0%	25.0%	15.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	62.7%	9.3%	24.0%	4.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	**0.0%**	8.3%	83.3%	8.3%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	58.8%	17.6%	21.6%	2.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	66.7%	16.7%	10.0%	6.7%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	63.6%	5.2%	20.8%	10.4%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	55.9%	7.4%	30.9%	5.9%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	**9.1%**	9.1%	72.7%	9.1%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	64.5%	12.9%	22.6%	0.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	42.1%	15.8%	38.2%	3.9%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	**34.5%**	19.0%	29.3%	17.2%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	66.4%	10.0%	21.4%	2.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**54.4%**	**16.7%**	**23.2%**	**5.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**53.5%**	**17.9%**	**22.3%**	**6.2%**
SITE S.D.				**17.7%**	**10.6%**	**15.2%**	**4.9%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Veteran became too ill to work in CWT/VI or other unspecified reason for discharge.

Table 29. Time Worked and Earnings in CWT/VI by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Total Mean Hours Worked in CWT/VI	Mean Hours Worked Per Week	Mean # of Weeks Worked	Total Mean Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Weekly Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI ††
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	216.6	22.3	9.8	$1,503.00	$162.99	$6.85
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	645.3	**18.0**	33.3	$5,472.19	$152.53	$8.26
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	1584.9	28.0	65.5	$12,580.60	$228.64	$7.98
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	409.5	**17.5**	22.5	$3,070.00	$143.15	$7.09
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	544.8	20.7	22.5	$4,143.03	$154.56	$7.57
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	399.9	**9.8**	30.6	$2,542.19	$63.49	$6.02
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	287.5	**17.8**	16.6	$2,053.22	$138.33	$7.47
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	690.9	33.0	21.3	$3,610.42	$176.31	$5.25
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	456.0	28.7	17.9	$2,476.09	$152.91	$5.19
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	252.3	31.6	8.6	$1,298.09	$166.07	$5.14
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	1032.6	31.7	31.7	$5,704.39	$173.43	$5.41
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	483.6	26.7	17.4	$2,612.69	$144.72	**$4.96**
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	777.0	34.4	23.5	$5,008.03	$223.20	$6.38
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	1315.8	32.2	43.4	$8,956.14	$229.06	$6.84
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	241.3	35.7	6.7	$1,417.43	$250.46	$5.96
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	503.2	32.6	15.6	$3,101.55	$201.43	$6.06
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	583.7	27.7	20.0	$3,527.24	$171.40	$6.09
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	1410.3	30.1	45.0	$7,661.46	$156.95	$5.23
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	241.0	23.0	10.8	$1,257.98	$121.78	$5.20
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	327.4	25.5	12.0	$1,841.15	$140.63	$5.35
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	551.2	36.2	15.3	$3,293.45	$216.75	$5.92
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	527.5	29.1	17.3	$3,011.94	$154.06	**$4.92**
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	331.3	24.1	11.7	$1,706.10	$126.85	$5.14
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	551.8	21.8	27.7	$2,903.29	$117.35	$5.29
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	286.4	22.1	13.5	$1,318.07	$114.58	**$4.76**
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	453.2	34.7	12.9	$2,407.96	$195.00	$5.46
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	856.8	32.1	26.7	$5,018.72	$191.14	$5.87
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	827.8	32.5	24.7	$4,479.45	$176.67	$5.41
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	585.4	30.5	19.5	$3,059.62	$167.78	$5.20
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	639.7	37.8	16.9	$3,375.41	$203.96	$5.33
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	576.9	29.7	26.2	$2,778.94	$182.67	$5.98
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	913.5	38.1	24.1	$5,143.99	$211.78	$5.50
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	449.2	28.0	16.6	$3,022.95	$187.58	$6.51
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	1216.6	29.8	40.0	$8,366.13	$198.02	$6.48
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	678.0	27.5	22.4	$4,047.90	$161.04	$5.87
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	466.5	38.2	13.0	$2,671.39	$229.55	$5.45
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	506.7	34.7	14.8	$2,771.40	$195.72	$5.48
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	709.9	36.0	19.7	$3,876.10	$206.28	$5.73
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	315.9	28.7	10.9	$1,654.90	$158.29	$5.17
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	1029.0	31.9	31.7	$5,530.14	$171.11	$5.29
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	720.0	34.0	21.3	$3,964.10	$187.27	$5.44
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	651.4	36.5	17.8	$3,486.53	$196.30	$5.26
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	672.4	27.8	24.3	$4,354.34	$183.38	$6.52
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	678.2	34.2	20.0	$3,499.45	$178.97	$5.16
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	676.4	36.1	18.4	$3,484.75	$188.20	$5.15
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	599.9	29.2	20.4	$3,090.13	$152.36	$5.13
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	752.0	31.6	23.4	$3,904.16	$166.51	$5.20
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	705.6	32.6	19.7	$4,197.90	$197.83	$5.81
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	138.5	**15.0**	11.1	$704.44	$80.72	**$4.99**
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	440.9	**15.5**	25.1	$3,070.53	$110.92	$6.98
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	632.0	30.0	19.7	$3,780.51	$182.10	$6.13

Table 29. Time Worked and Earnings in CWT/VI by Site for FY04 †

VISN	SITE	SITE	N	Total Mean Hours Worked in CWT/VI	Mean Hours Worked Per Week	Mean # of Weeks Worked	Total Mean Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Weekly Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI ††
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	300.9	20.8	14.7	$1,594.10	$119.4	$5.34
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	408.1	28.1	13.6	$2,747.68	$196.6	$6.88
11	550	Danville, IL	34	962.3	30.5	31.6	$5,536.38	$176.4	$5.65
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	1,058.2	34.6	31.1	$5,637.48	$186.2	$5.34
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	317.4	30.5	10.4	$1,876.99	$180.1	$5.61
12	578	Hines, IL	76	1,393.3	19.0	62.2	$7,177.83	$98.2	$5.18
12	607	Madison, WI	20	663.3	28.6	20.6	$6,017.60	$259.1	$8.75
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	486.1	25.3	18.2	$3,524.83	$186.3	$7.02
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	1,812.0	32.5	64.4	$16,653.48	$297.9	$9.07
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	574.5	29.4	19.8	$4,023.15	$206.5	$6.73
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	393.9	29.1	24.1	$1,877.50	$137.8	$4.74
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	942.5	30.0	31.8	$4,992.32	$164.6	$5.07
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	682.1	33.6	24.5	$3,580.66	$180.4	$5.25
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	350.7	29.7	12.1	$2,099.74	$176.7	$6.01
16	580	Houston, TX	184	681.6	30.7	21.7	$4,144.49	$183.1	$5.84
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	800.8	35.3	24.5	$4,805.05	$214.4	$6.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	624.8	36.9	18.3	$3,819.84	$224.9	$5.97
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	417.4	26.4	15.2	$2,275.54	$157.4	$5.54
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	493.1	16.3	20.5	$3,059.53	$98.7	$5.59
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	510.9	32.1	15.7	$2,637.51	$167.5	$5.16
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	275.1	11.2	21.2	$1,625.64	$60.9	$4.88
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	912.7	30.0	29.5	$5,168.75	$171.2	$5.67
17	674	Temple, TX	303	208.5	11.5	14.6	$1,203.96	$67.2	$5.33
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	510.9	21.8	22.2	$3,072.43	$138.4	$5.97
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	355.6	24.5	13.7	$2,156.80	$150.6	$5.99
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	705.4	30.0	22.7	$4,053.51	$174.2	$5.64
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	1,031.6	27.5	42.2	$6,241.59	$169.6	$6.03
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	923.4	29.4	29.1	$5,410.86	$170.8	$5.69
20	648	Portland, OR	81	639.0	32.9	19.9	$4,958.73	$261.6	$7.70
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	296.1	19.7	16.0	$1,696.94	$113.8	$5.73
20	692	White City, OR	151	378.1	21.3	16.9	$2,292.32	$133.8	$6.00
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	381.1	30.6	11.7	$2,657.91	$235.4	$7.37
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	514.6	17.0	25.0	$3,416.90	$109.7	$6.34
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	1,199.9	31.7	37.6	$12,366.12	$330.9	$10.37
21	654	Reno, NV	12	74.9	4.3	19.1	$386.83	$22.6	$5.29
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	1,010.4	28.2	36.4	$7,548.04	$212.1	$7.38
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	1,084.7	35.2	29.1	$6,242.60	$205.3	$5.79
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	690.1	21.6	31.4	$4,402.22	$139.1	$6.38
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	377.4	8.4	19.1	$2,612.59	$58.2	$5.73
22	691	West LA, CA	11	381.1	30.6	11.7	$2,657.91	$235.4	$7.37
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	794.2	30.0	28.1	$4,773.13	$185.5	$6.02
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	495.8	33.5	14.7	$3,178.17	$216.3	$6.29
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	1,171.0	27.5	41.6	$6,201.48	$145.0	$5.23
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	134.4	27.0	6.0	$1,018.77	$217.2	$7.03
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**539.0**	**26.5**	**20.0**	**$3,342.85**	**$164.88**	**$5.96**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**631.2**	**27.8**	**22.7**	**$3,907.76**	**$171.37**	**$5.99**
SITE S.D.				**327.5**	**7.1**	**11.2**	**$2,498.95**	**$49.74**	**$0.99**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Mean hourly wage is calculated by taking each veteran's total earnings in CWT/VI and dividing it by the veteran's total hours worked in CWT/VI.

Table 30a. CWT/VI Workshop Participation by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Workshop Placement %	Workshop on VA Grounds %	Workshop in the Community %	Workshop Placement Only %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	22.2%	16.1%	6.9%	11.7%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	2.9%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	100.0%	100.0%	1.9%	50.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	100.0%	72.9%	37.1%	80.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	17.0%	14.9%	2.1%	14.9%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	95.6%	0.9%	95.6%	29.2%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	4.1%	4.1%	0.8%	3.3%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	1.0%	0.7%	0.3%	1.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	17.3%	0.0%	17.3%	2.7%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	95.2%	95.2%	0.0%	38.7%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	30.0%	30.0%	0.0%	30.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	2.4%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	3.9%	3.9%	0.0%	2.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	4.8%	4.8%	4.8%	0.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%	2.8%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	13.3%	12.7%	0.6%	2.9%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	62.5%	62.5%	0.0%	13.5%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	4.1%	0.0%	4.1%	2.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	1.9%	1.9%	1.0%	1.9%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	60.0%	60.0%	0.0%	56.7%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	51.9%	51.9%	0.6%	35.1%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	6.2%	6.2%	0.0%	4.9%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	9.8%	9.8%	0.0%	4.9%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	3.1%	1.6%	1.6%	3.1%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	9.4%	9.4%	0.0%	9.4%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	16.5%	16.5%	1.2%	2.4%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	99.5%	99.5%	0.0%	64.7%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	2.2%	1.5%	0.7%	2.2%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	99.3%	98.6%	0.7%	54.2%

Table 30a cont. CWT/VI Workshop Participation by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Workshop Placement %	Workshop on VA Grounds %	Workshop in the Community %	Workshop Placement Only %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	55.2%	55.2%	0.0%	48.3%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	100.0%	100.0%	1.9%	26.4%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	2.2%	0.0%	2.2%	2.2%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	85.5%	85.5%	0.0%	3.9%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	55.7%	55.7%	0.0%	14.3%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	22.0%	22.0%	0.0%	10.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	98.5%	98.5%	7.5%	25.4%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	90.3%	90.3%	0.0%	19.4%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	1.8%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	13.0%	13.0%	0.0%	9.2%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	5.3%	0.0%	5.3%	5.3%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	100.0%	52.1%	75.8%	58.5%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	2.6%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	89.1%	88.4%	6.9%	52.1%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	4.5%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	81.0%	81.0%	14.3%	23.8%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	43.1%	43.1%	0.0%	38.9%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	30.5%	14.6%	15.9%	28.5%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	35.0%	25.0%	10.0%	25.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	17.6%	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	3.3%	3.3%	0.0%	3.3%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	66.2%	66.2%	0.0%	64.7%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	34.4%	34.4%	3.1%	6.3%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	2.6%	1.3%	1.3%	2.6%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	3.4%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	38.0%	37.6%	0.4%	36.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**31.5%**	**25.0%**	**8.5%**	**17.6%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**23.8%**	**20.0%**	**4.7%**	**12.5%**
SITE S.D.				**34.9%**	**32.1%**	**16.4%**	**20.7%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04:
VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain,
VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20,
Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 30b. CWT/VI Transitional Work Experience Participation by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Transitional Work Experience Placement %	Transitional Work Experience on VA Grounds %	Transitional Work Experience in the Community %	Transitional Work Experience Only %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	100.0%	76.0%	32.0%	100.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	87.9%	30.6%	74.2%	77.4%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	100.0%	100.0%	14.3%	97.1%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	100.0%	96.6%	5.1%	99.2%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	50.0%	50.0%	13.9%	0.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	20.0%	20.0%	4.3%	0.0%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	100.0%	96.5%	14.1%	100.0%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	100.0%	93.4%	13.2%	98.7%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	85.1%	63.8%	23.4%	83.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	100.0%	82.6%	17.4%	100.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	100.0%	98.1%	1.9%	100.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	70.8%	63.7%	8.0%	4.4%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	100.0%	100.0%	1.7%	100.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	92.6%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	96.7%	94.2%	3.3%	95.9%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	98.7%	98.7%	0.0%	98.7%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	100.0%	78.6%	21.4%	85.7%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	99.0%	99.0%	0.0%	99.0%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	97.3%	96.0%	8.0%	82.7%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	61.3%	43.5%	23.4%	4.8%
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	70.0%	70.0%	10.0%	70.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	100.0%	93.5%	6.5%	100.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	99.1%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	100.0%	96.6%	41.6%	99.4%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	100.0%	85.5%	21.7%	97.6%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	98.0%	92.2%	9.8%	96.1%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	61.9%	47.6%	19.0%	57.1%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	100.0%	95.5%	4.5%	100.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	97.2%	97.2%	0.0%	97.2%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	97.1%	94.2%	3.5%	86.7%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	86.5%	86.5%	0.0%	37.5%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	100.0%	17.4%	87.0%	100.0%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	98.0%	77.6%	26.5%	95.9%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	95.1%	85.4%	10.7%	95.1%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	43.3%	43.3%	0.0%	40.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	100.0%	81.2%	30.4%	100.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	64.9%	55.8%	19.5%	48.1%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	95.1%	95.1%	0.0%	93.8%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	95.1%	95.1%	0.0%	90.2%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	96.9%	96.9%	0.0%	96.9%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	90.6%	90.6%	0.0%	90.6%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	97.6%	97.6%	1.2%	83.5%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	35.3%	33.8%	1.5%	0.5%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	97.8%	21.3%	97.8%	97.8%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	45.8%	45.8%	0.0%	0.7%

Table 30b cont. CWT/VI Transitional Work Experience Participation by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Transitional Work Experience Placement %	Transitional Work Experience on VA Grounds %	Transitional Work Experience in the Community %	Transitional Work Experience Only %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	41.4%	37.9%	3.4%	34.5%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	73.6%	73.6%	0.0%	0.0%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	100.0%	97.1%	11.8%	100.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	97.8%	84.8%	13.0%	97.8%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	100.0%	100.0%	0.6%	98.8%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	96.1%	96.1%	5.3%	14.5%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	100.0%	80.0%	25.0%	100.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	85.7%	41.4%	57.1%	44.3%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	90.0%	62.0%	54.0%	78.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	74.6%	49.3%	40.3%	1.5%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	80.6%	32.3%	51.6%	9.7%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	98.3%	91.4%	6.9%	98.3%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	99.4%	99.4%	0.6%	98.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	90.8%	88.6%	4.9%	87.0%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	94.7%	94.7%	0.0%	94.7%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	66.7%	62.8%	11.5%	0.0%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	41.5%	41.2%	3.1%	0.0%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	97.4%	97.4%	7.7%	97.4%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	40.6%	37.6%	9.2%	3.6%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	100.0%	100.0%	1.0%	100.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	100.0%	89.8%	10.2%	100.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	95.5%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	76.2%	57.1%	52.4%	19.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	100.0%	96.3%	3.7%	100.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	61.1%	61.1%	2.8%	56.9%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	100.0%	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	71.5%	13.9%	57.6%	69.5%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	75.0%	55.0%	20.0%	65.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	100.0%	65.3%	41.3%	100.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	83.3%	83.3%	0.0%	83.3%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	100.0%	92.2%	9.8%	82.4%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	96.7%	76.7%	20.0%	96.7%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	100.0%	100.0%	7.8%	100.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	27.9%	22.1%	5.9%	26.5%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	93.8%	56.3%	50.0%	65.6%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	97.4%	36.8%	65.8%	97.4%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	98.3%	98.3%	0.0%	96.6%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	63.1%	5.2%	58.3%	61.3%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**81.9%**	**70.8%**	**15.4%**	**68.0%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**86.8%**	**75.9%**	**15.0%**	**75.4%**
SITE S.D.				**21.4%**	**27.3%**	**21.3%**	**35.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 31. Average Work Improvement Score and Improvement in Work Performance Areas by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Average Work Improvement ††	Personal Appearance/ Hygiene	Attendance/ Punctuality	Acceptance of Supervision	Ability to Get Along with Co-workers	Productivity	Quality of Production
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	1.6	60.0%	56.0%	40.0%	56.0%	72.0%	68.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	1.2	25.8%	25.2%	26.1%	25.6%	27.0%	27.4%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	1.6	77.1%	74.3%	68.6%	57.1%	62.9%	62.9%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	1.7	66.7%	80.5%	82.2%	83.1%	82.9%	85.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	1.8	85.2%	86.1%	85.2%	84.3%	83.3%	84.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	0.9	12.9%	18.6%	15.7%	17.1%	12.9%	14.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	1.6	70.2%	54.1%	75.3%	69.4%	63.5%	69.4%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	1.2	36.8%	14.5%	30.3%	42.1%	36.8%	34.2%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	1.8	86.7%	87.2%	87.2%	87.2%	89.4%	91.5%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	1.9	81.2%	89.9%	91.3%	91.3%	87.0%	89.9%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	1.4	49.1%	61.1%	59.3%	60.4%	61.1%	61.1%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	1.5	50.5%	46.8%	53.1%	54.9%	60.7%	58.9%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	1.6	99.2%	60.0%	95.0%	98.3%	60.8%	60.8%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	1.3	85.7%	50.0%	57.1%	64.3%	50.0%	50.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	2.0	100.0%	99.6%	99.6%	99.6%	99.6%	99.6%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	1.2	12.4%	32.8%	30.8%	29.8%	33.9%	34.7%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	1.2	42.7%	41.0%	41.6%	46.8%	44.7%	44.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	1.2	35.7%	39.3%	35.7%	46.4%	42.9%	42.9%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	1.7	75.5%	79.6%	75.5%	62.5%	81.6%	77.6%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	1.8	93.1%	84.0%	89.2%	90.6%	87.5%	88.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	1.9	98.7%	93.3%	88.0%	93.3%	97.3%	97.3%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	1.9	95.2%	87.9%	93.5%	94.4%	90.3%	92.7%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	1.6	50.0%	40.0%	70.0%	80.0%	60.0%	60.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	1.9	93.3%	80.0%	93.3%	93.5%	96.8%	96.8%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	1.6	61.8%	67.6%	65.5%	67.0%	67.9%	67.9%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	1.8	86.5%	82.6%	84.3%	83.1%	83.1%	84.3%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	1.5	51.8%	57.8%	67.5%	67.5%	59.0%	60.2%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	1.9	90.2%	92.2%	94.1%	96.1%	94.1%	94.1%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	1.3	42.9%	38.1%	47.6%	42.9%	47.6%	47.6%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	1.7	68.2%	68.2%	68.2%	68.2%	68.2%	68.2%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	2.0	100.0%	97.2%	98.6%	95.8%	93.1%	93.1%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	1.5	93.1%	68.2%	65.9%	67.1%	64.7%	65.3%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	1.7	67.7%	71.9%	62.5%	60.4%	72.9%	72.9%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	2.0	100.0%	95.7%	95.7%	95.7%	95.7%	95.7%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	1.9	98.0%	79.6%	87.8%	89.8%	87.8%	93.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	1.2	35.9%	31.1%	35.9%	34.0%	36.9%	37.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	1.9	96.7%	93.3%	86.7%	86.7%	86.7%	93.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	2.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	1.7	93.5%	73.4%	87.0%	87.7%	65.4%	68.8%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	1.6	66.3%	65.4%	76.5%	79.0%	69.1%	70.4%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	1.8	85.0%	67.5%	77.5%	77.5%	82.5%	85.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	1.7	78.7%	70.2%	70.2%	70.2%	70.2%	70.2%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	1.7	69.4%	80.6%	71.0%	69.4%	78.7%	77.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	1.8	77.1%	81.3%	85.7%	78.8%	89.1%	91.2%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	2.0	100.0%	100.0%	98.4%	98.4%	98.4%	98.4%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	1.5	59.4%	56.3%	56.3%	56.3%	56.3%	59.4%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	1.9	91.8%	91.8%	94.1%	94.1%	89.4%	90.6%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	1.4	43.3%	34.3%	50.7%	52.2%	46.3%	46.3%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	1.8	90.5%	83.4%	83.9%	84.4%	84.9%	85.4%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	1.8	79.3%	83.1%	81.6%	81.6%	100.0%	100.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	1.9	96.5%	91.5%	90.1%	90.1%	88.0%	90.1%

Table 31 cont. Average Work Improvement Score and Improvement in Work Performance Areas by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Average Work Improvement ††	Personal Appearance/ Hygiene	Attendance/ Punctuality	Acceptance of Supervision	Ability to Get Along with Co-workers	Productivity	Quality of Production
					WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS †††					
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	1.2	32.1%	20.7%	28.6%	17.9%	21.4%	28.6%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	1.5	75.5%	52.8%	62.3%	62.3%	52.8%	49.1%
11	550	Danville, IL	34	1.5	64.7%	58.8%	47.1%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	1.4	52.2%	45.7%	50.0%	41.3%	58.7%	58.7%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	2.0	100.0%	95.8%	100.0%	99.4%	97.0%	98.2%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	1.6	70.7%	63.2%	71.1%	73.7%	67.6%	67.1%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	1.7	61.1%	75.0%	70.0%	80.0%	70.0%	85.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	1.7	76.7%	74.3%	84.3%	72.9%	77.1%	80.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	1.8	72.0%	78.0%	88.0%	90.0%	82.0%	80.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	1.7	73.1%	68.7%	67.2%	68.7%	73.1%	70.1%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	1.6	71.4%	78.6%	78.6%	78.6%	71.4%	71.4%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	1.3	45.2%	35.5%	32.3%	25.8%	29.0%	32.3%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	1.9	98.3%	94.8%	98.3%	96.6%	91.4%	91.4%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	1.7	64.6%	73.2%	75.6%	73.8%	77.4%	76.2%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	1.7	85.9%	56.5%	78.8%	83.7%	82.6%	83.2%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	1.1	15.8%	10.5%	15.8%	15.8%	26.3%	26.3%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	1.4	38.3%	43.8%	43.8%	42.2%	52.3%	53.1%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	1.6	69.2%	71.8%	76.9%	82.1%	69.2%	69.2%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	1.2	45.0%	37.2%	35.9%	38.4%	37.4%	34.1%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	1.9	97.4%	92.3%	97.4%	92.3%	94.9%	94.9%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	1.6	62.9%	60.5%		60.5%	60.5%	59.7%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	1.7	72.2%	63.9%	75.0%	91.7%	77.8%	77.8%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	1.7	76.1%	72.9%	72.1%	70.7%	72.0%	72.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	1.6	67.0%	58.8%	64.9%	69.1%	63.9%	68.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	1.7	75.5%	75.5%	75.5%	75.5%	74.5%	74.5%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	1.4	56.1%	49.1%	50.9%	54.4%	49.1%	49.1%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	1.7	61.5%	63.2%	80.0%	78.9%	81.8%	81.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	1.7	85.7%	71.4%	81.0%	85.7%	71.4%	76.2%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	1.9	93.8%	78.6%	94.9%	93.6%	98.8%	98.8%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	1.1	13.6%	18.8%	11.4%	15.7%	23.2%	21.7%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	1.0	18.2%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	18.2%	18.2%
20	692	White City, OR	151	1.7	81.5%	82.1%	82.1%	81.1%	82.8%	84.1%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	1.4	60.0%	45.0%	60.0%	60.0%	40.0%	60.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	1.7	76.4%	70.3%	76.0%	72.6%	74.3%	74.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	0.8	33.3%	16.7%	25.0%	25.0%	18.2%	18.2%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	1.5	62.0%	62.7%	64.7%	58.8%	62.7%	56.9%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	1.8	80.0%	80.0%	76.7%	76.7%	80.0%	83.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	2.0	87.0%	93.5%	98.7%	96.1%	100.0%	98.7%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	1.7	75.0%	71.2%	67.6%	71.6%	70.6%	72.1%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	1.5	54.5%	45.5%	45.5%	45.5%	45.5%	45.5%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	1.6	74.2%	68.8%	73.3%	68.8%	68.8%	71.9%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	1.8	100.0%	93.4%	81.6%	84.2%	88.2%	88.2%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	1.3	48.3%	50.0%	50.0%	48.3%	46.6%	46.6%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	1.6	63.8%	57.9%	62.7%	62.0%	77.1%	77.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**1.64**	**71.6%**	**67.1%**	**70.4%**	**70.5%**	**70.0%**	**70.5%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**1.62**	**69.4%**	**65.2%**	**68.6%**	**68.9%**	**68.3%**	**69.2%**
SITE S.D.				**0.26**	**23.1%**	**22.9%**	**23.0%**	**22.8%**	**22.0%**	**22.1%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Average Work Improvement score is the mean of the five work performance areas, range 0-2 (0=deteriorated, 1=unchanged, and 2=improved).

††† Improvement is noted for only those veterans with a problem in that category.

Table 32. Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Problems Improved %	Drug Problems Improved %	Non-Substance Abuse Mental Health Problems Improved %	Medical Problems Improved %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	64.7%	57.1%	75.0%	40.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	30.2%	29.6%	18.6%	14.0%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	57.6%	55.2%	35.3%	48.6%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	84.4%	82.6%	61.3%	26.2%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	63.4%	72.0%	72.4%	67.9%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	17.0%	5.4%	13.6%	8.1%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	68.3%	68.0%	57.8%	23.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	56.9%	55.3%	17.5%	8.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	82.9%	77.4%	70.0%	50.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	94.2%	92.8%	95.7%	95.7%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	51.7%	46.2%	48.6%	34.1%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	46.3%	44.2%	20.5%	2.4%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	81.8%	70.5%	52.7%	44.4%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	84.6%	92.9%	46.2%	77.8%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	99.6%	98.8%	98.7%	98.6%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	30.4%	28.2%	16.5%	11.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	40.0%	47.1%	40.3%	24.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	47.6%	43.8%	44.4%	27.8%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	81.0%	82.4%	56.0%	27.6%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	93.7%	91.1%	81.5%	73.8%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	96.6%	93.1%	79.3%	20.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	91.4%	88.9%	74.5%	6.0%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	55.6%	50.0%	55.6%	40.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	36.4%	46.2%	35.0%	5.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	87.8%	88.5%	65.1%	13.2%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	81.9%	84.3%	68.1%	56.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	54.2%	58.6%	52.8%	29.1%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	91.5%	95.5%	65.0%	6.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	52.4%	43.8%	31.6%	16.7%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	16.7%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	85.5%	94.6%	96.0%	81.3%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	57.8%	56.0%	48.5%	30.4%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	47.1%	44.9%	43.7%	12.7%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	94.1%	85.7%	100.0%	83.3%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	83.7%	69.4%	83.7%	93.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	36.1%	26.2%	24.6%	26.7%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	82.1%	100.0%	83.3%	87.5%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	73.9%	73.2%	65.7%	37.2%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	69.0%	67.5%	53.1%	39.3%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	82.1%	80.0%	69.0%	2.9%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	74.4%	71.0%	70.4%	10.3%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	83.9%	78.3%	65.6%	31.6%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	92.0%	93.8%	63.0%	8.3%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	100.0%	92.5%	96.5%	75.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	43.3%	39.3%	52.0%	48.3%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	81.6%	84.9%	79.2%	86.5%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	47.6%	47.5%	19.0%	5.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	90.1%	89.5%	80.2%	50.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	66.7%	66.1%	67.9%	73.3%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	80.2%	83.0%	76.0%	57.8%

Table 32 cont. Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Problems Improved %	Drug Problems Improved %	Non-Substance Abuse Mental Health Problems Improved %	Medical Problems Improved %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	11.8%	16.7%	13.6%	8.3%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	54.7%	50.9%	26.4%	26.4%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	48.4%	34.8%	44.0%	6.3%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	60.0%	52.4%	59.3%	32.1%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	90.8%	89.9%	75.0%	55.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	76.1%	75.6%	51.0%	16.3%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	63.2%	50.0%	43.8%	15.4%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	68.3%	69.4%	57.7%	45.5%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	83.0%	82.6%	84.8%	69.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	50.0%	54.0%	50.8%	50.0%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	69.2%	81.8%	58.3%	33.3%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	44.0%	33.3%	38.9%	16.7%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	90.9%	90.7%	87.0%	76.9%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	51.1%	45.5%	37.8%	20.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	57.9%	57.8%	47.7%	10.1%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	50.0%	53.6%	35.0%	20.7%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	67.5%	65.1%	16.3%	20.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	79.4%	78.0%	24.0%	8.5%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	23.2%	27.9%	15.8%	11.6%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	90.9%	81.5%	85.7%	80.8%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	50.5%	53.3%	63.5%	60.6%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	55.6%	53.3%	50.0%	25.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	61.3%	59.1%	66.5%	56.5%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	63.9%	65.6%	53.6%	26.9%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	92.9%	93.6%	69.4%	73.6%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	46.8%	52.6%	35.3%	32.4%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	69.2%	85.7%	61.1%	22.2%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	66.7%	53.3%	45.5%	66.7%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	85.7%	96.8%	97.7%	98.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	15.8%	12.7%	25.7%	15.9%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	33.3%	12.5%	20.0%	0.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	87.3%	90.5%	77.8%	67.0%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	41.2%	53.3%	28.6%	38.5%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	65.5%	70.3%	42.9%	42.6%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	53.7%	52.1%	41.9%	25.6%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	78.6%	78.6%	73.3%	73.3%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	91.8%	89.7%	77.1%	65.1%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	65.1%	67.6%	52.1%	44.0%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	42.9%	57.1%	60.0%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	65.5%	71.4%	72.0%	84.2%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	90.3%	100.0%	87.8%	88.9%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	62.0%	41.9%	55.9%	15.2%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	66.0%	58.6%	25.7%	9.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**67.0%**	**66.0%**	**55.0%**	**40.0%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**65.2%**	**64.5%**	**55.1%**	**38.9%**
SITE S.D.				**22.5%**	**23.7%**	**24.0%**	**28.8%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 33. Employment Status at Discharge by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Ready for Competitive Employment %	Competitively Employed at Discharge %	Employed in VA's IT %	Student, Trainee or Unpaid Volunteer %	Unemployed %	Retired/ Disabled %	Unknown %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	25	52.0%	32.0%	0.0%	20.0%	8.0%	36.0%	0.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	248	56.9%	23.8%	0.0%	0.8%	47.6%	4.8%	17.3%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	35	45.7%	40.0%	0.0%	5.7%	40.0%	11.4%	2.9%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	118	52.1%	28.8%	0.0%	1.7%	45.8%	9.3%	5.1%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	108	53.7%	41.7%	0.9%	3.7%	26.9%	7.4%	19.4%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	70	17.1%	18.6%	0.0%	1.4%	37.1%	27.1%	12.9%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	85	63.5%	37.6%	0.0%	7.1%	31.8%	16.5%	1.2%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	76	53.9%	42.1%	3.9%	3.9%	23.7%	13.2%	2.6%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	47	59.6%	40.4%	0.0%	2.1%	12.8%	8.5%	14.9%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	69	91.3%	8.7%	8.7%	37.7%	42.0%	1.4%	1.4%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	54	64.8%	48.1%	0.0%	9.3%	20.4%	14.8%	5.6%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	50.4%	45.1%	0.0%	1.8%	34.5%	7.1%	7.1%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	120	59.2%	50.0%	0.8%	2.5%	30.8%	10.8%	5.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	14	42.9%	28.6%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	42.9%	7.1%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	269	98.5%	66.5%	7.1%	0.4%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	121	65.3%	47.9%	2.5%	0.8%	21.5%	5.8%	14.0%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	78	42.3%	26.9%	0.0%	3.8%	41.0%	7.7%	11.5%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	28	35.7%	28.6%	7.1%	0.0%	32.1%	10.7%	21.4%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	49	61.2%	20.4%	2.0%	0.0%	59.2%	0.0%	8.2%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	289	86.9%	46.4%	0.3%	0.0%	12.1%	6.6%	31.8%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	75	82.7%	46.7%	2.7%	2.7%	33.3%	6.7%	8.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	124	72.6%	46.8%	2.4%	4.0%	27.4%	16.9%	1.6%
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	10	70.0%	70.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	31	67.7%	32.3%	9.7%	16.1%	9.7%	6.5%	12.9%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	112	71.4%	34.8%	0.9%	3.6%	39.3%	11.6%	7.1%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	178	74.7%	34.8%	0.6%	1.1%	24.2%	15.2%	10.1%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	83	53.0%	44.6%	0.0%	3.6%	36.1%	12.0%	3.6%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	51	96.1%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	23.5%	0.0%	7.8%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	21	47.6%	38.1%	0.0%	4.8%	23.8%	14.3%	19.0%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	22	63.6%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.5%	4.5%	0.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	72	65.3%	48.6%	0.0%	2.8%	33.3%	15.3%	0.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	173	56.1%	50.9%	0.0%	4.0%	16.8%	9.2%	17.3%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	96	41.7%	38.5%	0.0%	1.0%	26.0%	19.8%	11.5%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	23	65.2%	65.2%	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%	13.0%	13.0%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	49	61.2%	53.1%	0.0%	8.2%	14.3%	14.3%	10.2%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	103	78.6%	31.1%	0.0%	2.9%	54.4%	5.8%	2.9%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	30	86.7%	43.3%	0.0%	3.3%	26.7%	3.3%	20.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	69	88.4%	58.0%	5.8%	7.2%	15.9%	1.4%	10.1%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	154	69.5%	51.3%	1.9%	9.7%	1.9%	25.3%	4.5%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	81	64.2%	56.8%	1.2%	3.7%	17.3%	9.9%	11.1%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	40	82.5%	57.5%	2.5%	7.5%	15.0%	7.5%	10.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	47	74.5%	66.0%	0.0%	4.3%	6.4%	2.1%	17.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	83.9%	66.1%	0.0%	6.5%	1.6%	6.5%	17.7%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	102	88.2%	65.7%	0.0%	1.0%	26.5%	2.0%	3.9%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	64	79.7%	79.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	6.3%	0.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	32	56.3%	28.1%	0.0%	6.3%	46.9%	0.0%	18.8%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	85	84.7%	44.7%	7.1%	2.4%	20.0%	3.5%	21.2%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	67	61.2%	32.8%	0.0%	0.0%	37.3%	17.9%	11.9%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	201	73.1%	51.2%	5.5%	0.5%	10.4%	16.4%	11.4%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	136	61.8%	37.5%	0.7%	6.6%	21.3%	22.8%	10.3%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	142	42.3%	28.9%	0.0%	5.6%	35.2%	19.0%	8.5%
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	31.0%	27.6%	3.4%	0.0%	48.3%	3.4%	6.9%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	49.1%	30.2%	11.3%	5.7%	26.4%	11.3%	13.2%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	64.7%	38.2%	0.0%	2.9%	23.5%	17.6%	8.8%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	56.5%	45.7%	2.2%	2.2%	17.4%	17.4%	10.9%

Table 33 cont. Employment Status at Discharge by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Ready for Competitive Employment %	Competitively Employed at Discharge %	Employed in VA's IT %	Student, Trainee or Unpaid Volunteer %	Unemployed %	Retired/ Disabled %	Unknown %
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	84.4%	61.7%	1.2%	1.8%	31.1%	3.6%	0.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	55.3%	48.7%	0.0%	3.9%	2.6%	35.5%	7.9%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	50.0%	40.0%	0.0%	10.0%	35.0%	10.0%	5.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	50.0%	40.0%	0.0%	1.4%	30.0%	14.3%	11.4%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	48.0%	26.0%	0.0%	2.0%	46.0%	16.0%	8.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	65.7%	49.3%	1.5%	3.0%	16.4%	13.4%	13.4%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	71.4%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	7.1%	7.1%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	77.4%	32.3%	0.0%	0.0%	41.9%	9.7%	12.9%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	65.5%	43.1%	3.4%	1.7%	12.1%	10.3%	20.7%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	75.0%	34.5%	0.0%	0.0%	48.8%	7.7%	6.0%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	45.7%	39.7%	0.0%	2.7%	20.7%	14.1%	16.8%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	84.2%	36.8%	0.0%	0.0%	44.7%	2.6%	15.8%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	77.3%	59.4%	0.8%	1.6%	30.5%	1.6%	6.3%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	47.4%	30.8%	0.0%	1.3%	37.2%	11.5%	19.2%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	27.0%	16.1%	0.0%	6.4%	33.2%	10.0%	33.2%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	66.7%	38.5%	12.8%	0.0%	15.4%	23.1%	5.1%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	46.0%	25.8%	6.5%	1.6%	16.1%	28.2%	20.2%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	63.9%	50.0%	0.0%	5.6%	2.8%	11.1%	25.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	86.8%	45.5%	0.3%	0.7%	36.0%	6.9%	9.2%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	62.9%	39.2%	7.2%	6.2%	10.3%	15.5%	18.6%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	79.6%	41.8%	3.1%	1.0%	43.9%	10.2%	0.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	36.8%	29.8%	0.0%	0.0%	21.1%	24.6%	21.1%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	77.3%	68.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	4.5%	13.6%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	52.4%	38.1%	0.0%	4.8%	19.0%	4.8%	28.6%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	76.5%	48.1%	0.0%	4.9%	29.6%	4.9%	12.3%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	68.1%	34.7%	8.3%	20.8%	16.7%	15.3%	4.2%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	63.6%	45.5%	27.3%	9.1%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	70.2%	51.7%	4.0%	6.0%	11.3%	17.9%	8.6%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	25.0%	20.0%	5.0%	0.0%	35.0%	15.0%	20.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	65.3%	54.7%	0.0%	2.7%	25.3%	6.7%	10.7%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	41.7%	50.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	52.9%	37.3%	0.0%	7.8%	35.3%	11.8%	7.8%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	66.7%	60.0%	0.0%	3.3%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	55.8%	50.6%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	18.2%	11.7%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	23.5%	14.7%	30.9%	2.9%	27.9%	11.8%	10.3%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	54.5%	63.6%	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	18.2%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	65.6%	37.5%	0.0%	15.6%	6.3%	9.4%	21.9%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	88.0%	56.6%	0.0%	2.6%	14.5%	14.5%	7.9%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	63.8%	34.5%	0.0%	0.0%	20.7%	15.5%	25.9%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	75.6%	32.8%	3.0%	1.8%	46.1%	5.5%	8.1%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				**64.7%**	**41.7%**	**1.9%**	**3.6%**	**26.3%**	**11.0%**	**11.8%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**61.2%**	**41.4%**	**2.1%**	**4.0%**	**24.5%**	**11.5%**	**11.0%**
SITE S.D.				**19.5%**	**15.4%**	**4.8%**	**5.5%**	**14.1%**	**8.7%**	**8.5%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04:   VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

Table 34. Housing Status at Discharge by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Homeless / Unknown %	Other %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	76.0%	0.0%	8.0%	12.0%	4.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	44.4%	13.7%	7.3%	31.9%	2.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	64.7%	2.9%	14.7%	17.6%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	31.4%	48.3%	6.8%	12.7%	0.8%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	36.1%	11.1%	10.2%	42.6%	0.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	68.6%	14.3%	1.4%	12.9%	2.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	55.3%	25.9%	8.2%	7.1%	3.5%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	90.8%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	3.9%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	51.1%	29.8%	8.5%	8.5%	2.1%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	39.1%	49.3%	8.7%	2.9%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	77.8%	16.7%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	74.3%	7.1%	1.8%	15.9%	0.9%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	65.8%	10.0%	3.3%	19.2%	1.7%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	85.7%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	64.2%	9.0%	25.7%	1.1%	0.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	66.1%	2.5%	14.9%	16.5%	0.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	44.9%	11.5%	0.0%	41.0%	2.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	46.4%	25.0%	14.3%	10.7%	3.6%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	49.0%	18.4%	20.4%	12.2%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	19.7%	12.1%	38.1%	29.4%	0.7%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	52.0%	25.3%	5.3%	14.7%	2.7%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	67.7%	10.5%	17.7%	2.4%	1.6%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	50.0%	30.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	58.1%	19.4%	6.5%	9.7%	6.5%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	42.9%	44.6%	1.8%	9.8%	0.9%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	42.7%	17.4%	28.7%	9.6%	1.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	59.0%	24.1%	2.4%	14.5%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	43.1%	39.2%	2.0%	13.7%	2.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	52.4%	9.5%	0.0%	33.3%	4.8%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	68.2%	31.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	69.4%	9.7%	2.8%	18.1%	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	29.5%	37.6%	1.7%	29.5%	1.7%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	70.8%	3.1%	7.3%	15.6%	3.1%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	65.2%	13.0%	4.3%	17.4%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	51.0%	20.4%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	70.9%	23.3%	1.0%	4.9%	0.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	60.0%	3.3%	16.7%	16.7%	3.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	94.2%	0.0%	1.4%	2.9%	1.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	77.3%	7.8%	5.8%	7.1%	1.9%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	71.6%	4.9%	14.8%	8.6%	0.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	52.5%	35.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	61.7%	14.9%	2.1%	17.0%	4.3%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	80.6%	1.6%	0.0%	16.1%	1.6%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	57.8%	15.7%	1.0%	23.5%	2.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	82.8%	6.3%	0.0%	10.9%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	34.4%	31.3%	0.0%	34.4%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	58.8%	4.7%	11.8%	23.5%	1.2%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	53.7%	19.4%	0.0%	26.9%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	45.3%	4.0%	39.8%	7.5%	3.5%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	66.9%	8.1%	2.9%	20.6%	1.5%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	71.1%	0.7%	7.7%	16.9%	3.5%

Table 34 cont. Housing Status at Discharge by Site for FY04 †

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Homeless / Unknown %	Other %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	62.1%	6.9%	0.0%	27.6%	3.4%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	66.0%	11.3%	3.8%	17.0%	1.9%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	70.6%	0.0%	5.9%	14.7%	8.8%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	54.3%	34.8%	0.0%	8.7%	2.2%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	26.9%	24.0%	40.7%	7.8%	0.6%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	76.3%	10.5%	2.6%	10.5%	0.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	65.0%	25.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	54.3%	22.9%	2.9%	12.9%	7.1%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	80.0%	4.0%	8.0%	8.0%	0.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	71.6%	6.0%	9.0%	10.4%	3.0%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	57.1%	28.6%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	61.3%	3.2%	3.2%	29.0%	3.2%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	22.4%	22.4%	31.0%	24.1%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	44.0%	0.6%	38.1%	16.1%	1.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	48.4%	28.8%	4.9%	14.1%	3.8%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	44.7%	39.5%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	43.8%	12.5%	36.7%	7.0%	0.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	43.6%	16.7%	5.1%	34.6%	0.0%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	30.3%	3.1%	10.9%	55.0%	0.7%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	46.2%	2.6%	41.0%	7.7%	2.6%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	46.0%	6.5%	8.1%	37.9%	1.6%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	77.8%	0.0%	2.8%	16.7%	2.8%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	49.8%	1.7%	9.9%	37.0%	1.7%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	63.9%	10.3%	5.2%	18.6%	2.1%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	46.9%	25.5%	12.2%	15.3%	0.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	43.9%	29.8%	0.0%	26.3%	0.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	68.2%	13.6%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	61.9%	9.5%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	69.1%	14.8%	1.2%	14.8%	0.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	76.4%	8.3%	5.6%	9.7%	0.0%
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	54.5%	36.4%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	33.1%	4.6%	49.0%	11.9%	1.3%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	50.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	10.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	65.3%	16.0%	1.3%	17.3%	0.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	41.7%	16.7%	0.0%	33.3%	8.3%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	76.5%	13.7%	2.0%	7.8%	0.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	80.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	81.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.9%	1.3%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	58.8%	25.0%	2.9%	11.8%	1.5%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	54.5%	9.1%	9.1%	27.3%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	53.1%	21.9%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	68.4%	18.4%	2.6%	9.2%	1.3%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	62.1%	12.1%	15.5%	8.6%	1.7%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	51.7%	3.0%	27.7%	16.6%	1.1%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,224)				53.7%	13.5%	12.6%	18.7%	1.5%
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				58.1%	15.3%	8.3%	16.5%	1.8%
SITE S.D.				15.5%	12.0%	11.4%	10.3%	2.3%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

†† Includes own apartment, room or house; apartment, room or house of friend or family member.

Table 35. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY04 †, ††, †††, ††††

| | | | | Site Median Value | 1.60 | 65.1% | 53.3% | 69.4% | 45.5% | 47.9% | 25.3% | 10.3% |
| | | | | Veteran Average | 1.64 | 66.5% | 65.5% | 54.5% | 40.4% | 41.7% | 26.2% | 11.8% |

VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	0.03	20.4%	15.2%	32.5%	13.4%	2.1%	-14.0%	-7.5%
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	-0.43	-34.6%	-25.0%	-44.4%	-16.7%	-14.5%	23.2%	8.2%
1	523	Boston, MA	35	0.06	-24.7%	-23.8%	-37.8%	18.6%	1.6%	17.3%	-6.6%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	0.11	31.4%	31.7%	4.9%	-4.3%	-14.3%	21.7%	-5.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	0.24	13.0%	20.7%	23.4%	40.5%	1.5%	2.1%	9.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	70	-0.62	-50.5%	-55.9%	-51.1%	-32.5%	-11.7%	14.8%	3.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	0.00	9.1%	12.5%	-7.8%	-8.7%	1.7%	8.6%	-7.7%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	-0.43	-8.5%	-11.2%	-42.8%	-35.6%	1.2%	0.1%	-6.9%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	0.18	19.4%	9.1%	-4.0%	-3.4%	-5.9%	-12.3%	5.2%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	0.19	41.4%	41.3%	42.7%	63.4%	-41.0%	16.2%	-8.6%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	-0.21	-26.7%	-44.1%	-22.3%	-11.1%	5.3%	-3.5%	-3.7%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	-0.13	-17.0%	-18.0%	-45.8%	-25.6%	4.3%	10.1%	-2.8%
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	-0.05	30.2%	5.8%	-27.0%	-38.4%	6.5%	6.8%	-5.7%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	-0.26	23.0%	38.2%	-47.6%	29.4%	-12.8%	-16.7%	-3.3%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	0.32	47.2%	47.0%	45.9%	66.9%	16.4%	-21.4%	-10.1%
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	-0.43	-29.1%	-32.4%	-54.2%	-19.1%	0.0%	-3.0%	3.6%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	-0.42	-33.6%	-25.5%	-39.4%	-18.6%	-9.8%	16.2%	0.3%
3	632	Northport, NY	28	-0.42	-28.0%	-28.8%	-42.2%	-4.1%	-15.5%	7.5%	10.7%
4	529	Butler, PA	49	0.07	27.3%	29.0%	0.2%	-2.7%	-27.8%	34.3%	-1.8%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	0.22	46.0%	38.7%	23.2%	43.1%	0.3%	-12.4%	20.5%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	0.26	44.1%	35.3%	28.6%	-27.5%	-2.5%	8.8%	-2.3%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	0.25	34.2%	31.6%	19.7%	-24.5%	1.5%	3.5%	-8.1%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	-0.07	7.0%	-24.1%	-6.5%	10.5%	21.4%	-14.7%	0.7%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	0.25	-11.2%	-8.6%	-21.2%	-31.9%	-11.0%	-14.6%	2.5%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	0.03	41.5%	39.2%	15.1%	-17.3%	-8.9%	14.3%	-3.5%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	0.17	23.7%	27.1%	8.9%	18.7%	-11.5%	-0.2%	0.5%
5	688	Washington, DC	83	-0.11	-12.5%	-11.4%	-9.7%	-4.1%	0.2%	11.7%	-6.7%
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	0.23	35.6%	40.9%	7.8%	-31.4%	15.2%	0.0%	-2.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	-0.32	-12.3%	-19.3%	-26.7%	-19.9%	-3.9%	-0.5%	8.5%
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	0.04	-44.4%	-36.2%	-88.1%	-55.9%	3.9%	20.3%	-11.6%
6	658	Salem, VA	72	0.34	28.5%	47.0%	50.8%	45.9%	2.9%	8.9%	-11.2%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	-0.18	-17.3%	-19.6%	-8.4%	-9.6%	1.4%	-7.6%	6.8%
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	0.06	-2.4%	-5.4%	-6.5%	-25.8%	-4.2%	1.3%	0.7%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	0.30	43.8%	37.9%	48.6%	48.7%	16.1%	-15.5%	2.2%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	0.23	24.9%	-0.8%	30.5%	64.0%	6.2%	-9.7%	-0.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	-0.44	-24.2%	-36.0%	-26.7%	-7.2%	-13.1%	30.0%	-7.5%
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	0.21	23.4%	49.5%	30.1%	55.5%	-8.1%	2.6%	9.4%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	0.38	54.1%	54.4%	51.8%	73.5%	13.1%	-8.5%	-0.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	0.09	18.7%	21.7%	10.5%	-21.0%	10.9%	-21.7%	-5.9%

Table 35 cont. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY04 †, ††, †††, ††††

	Site Median Value			1.60	65.1%	53.3%	69.4%	45.5%	47.9%	25.3%	10.3%
	Veteran Average			1.64	66.5%	65.5%	54.5%	40.4%	41.7%	26.2%	11.8%
VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	-0.01	-8.1%	-2.9%	-12.8%	5.4%	10.3%	-6.3%	2.4%
8	546	Miami, FL	40	0.16	25.8%	22.2%	17.6%	-23.4%	14.7%	-10.1%	-0.5%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	0.02	7.3%	8.1%	14.9%	-22.8%	18.3%	-17.9%	7.9%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	0.09	32.5%	20.9%	16.4%	-19.3%	21.3%	-23.1%	7.1%
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	0.10	36.4%	40.4%	2.8%	-25.4%	15.7%	2.4%	-6.3%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	0.33	52.8%	44.7%	45.3%	39.6%	29.2%	-10.5%	-11.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	-0.13	-22.6%	-21.3%	-5.8%	8.6%	-19.4%	22.8%	8.1%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	0.25	29.8%	33.3%	28.6%	51.6%	-3.6%	-4.6%	11.6%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	-0.25	-21.4%	-20.2%	-51.4%	-38.4%	-7.0%	13.5%	1.2%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	0.22	42.0%	40.6%	34.5%	20.0%	8.9%	-13.1%	1.5%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	0.17	12.0%	12.2%	16.8%	44.6%	-8.7%	-2.4%	0.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	0.26	28.6%	30.6%	25.1%	19.8%	-17.3%	10.2%	-1.9%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	29	-0.42	-56.9%	-57.6%	-42.5%	-28.7%	-5.8%	25.2%	-2.2%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	53	-0.10	2.6%	-3.1%	-27.8%	-5.8%	-13.7%	1.0%	2.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	34	-0.12	-8.2%	-38.7%	-18.5%	-36.2%	-4.5%	-0.7%	-2.5%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	-0.19	-22.1%	-32.3%	-7.2%	-23.1%	2.2%	-7.1%	0.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	167	0.31	33.1%	29.7%	16.1%	24.7%	13.8%	7.0%	-10.3%
12	578	Hines, IL	76	-0.07	18.0%	10.1%	-25.2%	-37.5%	8.1%	-20.5%	-1.4%
12	607	Madison, WI	20	0.06	-1.0%	-10.2%	-3.4%	-18.3%	-2.5%	10.7%	-4.1%
12	676	Tomah, WI	70	0.10	-8.8%	1.1%	-13.8%	0.0%	-1.8%	5.7%	2.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	50	0.17	25.5%	30.1%	32.8%	34.3%	-17.4%	21.6%	-2.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	67	0.03	-5.6%	-5.6%	-13.7%	15.7%	2.2%	-8.7%	2.8%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	14	-0.01	-6.3%	17.3%	-5.5%	-2.0%	6.6%	3.4%	-2.5%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	31	-0.35	-32.2%	-46.9%	-19.6%	-42.3%	-14.0%	17.5%	3.5%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	58	0.31	33.4%	33.3%	31.7%	38.3%	-0.3%	-13.4%	10.7%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	168	0.05	-8.4%	-11.6%	-23.1%	-23.5%	-11.0%	24.0%	-4.4%
16	580	Houston, TX	184	0.05	-28.4%	-28.4%	-23.7%	-33.5%	-5.5%	-3.5%	6.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	38	-0.56	-8.6%	-10.9%	-38.2%	-16.5%	-9.3%	20.0%	4.7%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	128	-0.27	-2.9%	-8.2%	-41.9%	-18.9%	8.3%	6.2%	-3.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	78	-0.01	18.1%	18.4%	-60.0%	-25.3%	-13.1%	11.7%	8.5%
17	549	Dallas, TX	422	-0.39	-30.4%	-41.6%	-51.6%	-22.7%	-27.8%	8.5%	21.7%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	39	0.27	37.5%	16.0%	25.5%	38.2%	-9.0%	-9.5%	-4.7%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	0.00	-0.6%	0.0%	11.1%	32.7%	-14.6%	-9.0%	8.6%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	36	0.07	-8.6%	-14.6%	-24.9%	-6.2%	6.2%	-20.9%	15.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	303	0.05	0.5%	-6.2%	6.7%	24.5%	-0.2%	11.2%	-0.3%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	97	-0.03	-2.9%	15.3%	-14.2%	-2.8%	-2.3%	-14.3%	9.4%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	98	0.10	36.9%	42.7%	0.0%	33.9%	-1.4%	19.5%	-8.4%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	57	-0.24	-16.9%	-9.9%	-28.8%	-20.8%	-15.4%	-3.1%	11.7%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	22	0.10	7.9%	24.7%	-4.7%	-4.4%	25.4%	-15.4%	4.7%

Table 35 cont. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY04 †, ††, †††, ††††

					ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
		Site Median Value		1.60	65.1%	53.3%	69.4%	45.5%	47.9%	25.3%	10.3%
		Veteran Average		1.64	66.5%	65.5%	54.5%	40.4%	41.7%	26.2%	11.8%
VISN	**SITE**	**SITE**	**#VETS**	**AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT**							
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	0.10	4.3%	-16.5%	-12.9%	32.3%	-7.4%	-5.8%	**18.7%**
20	648	Portland, OR	81	0.26	23.9%	46.8%	47.4%	69.3%	4.1%	4.7%	3.1%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	**-0.50**	**-45.0%**	**-37.6%**	**-31.5%**	-18.0%	-4.3%	-7.1%	-4.2%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	**-0.58**	-23.2%	-45.3%	-29.8%	-25.6%	3.1%	-5.2%	-8.9%
20	692	White City, OR	151	0.08	27.5%	34.8%	19.5%	24.1%	6.7%	-13.3%	-0.5%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	-0.18	-35.6%	-6.7%	**-43.6%**	2.3%	-13.7%	10.7%	11.3%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	0.03	11.4%	11.7%	-18.5%	4.9%	12.3%	0.0%	0.6%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	**-0.75**	**-123.8%**	**-76.4%**	**-73.1%**	36.0%	**-32.4%**	-23.3%	**41.2%**
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	-0.08	-7.8%	-16.4%	-21.1%	**-22.3%**	2.6%	11.5%	-1.2%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	0.14	24.7%	26.8%	19.3%	48.3%	20.8%	-3.4%	-9.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	0.34	37.8%	36.4%	20.6%	27.8%	10.7%	-23.4%	1.8%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	0.09	0.0%	11.5%	-14.2%	13.5%	**-20.2%**	5.1%	2.6%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	-0.18	-20.4%	-5.4%	1.1%	-28.6%	20.1%	-6.8%	-9.6%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	-0.07	-14.1%	-5.2%	13.6%	57.4%	-7.6%	-18.6%	**12.7%**
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	0.17	32.9%	50.4%	38.1%	57.6%	12.8%	-11.2%	-1.1%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	**-0.29**	4.4%	-24.6%	-7.2%	**-24.9%**	-10.0%	-3.5%	**16.6%**
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	0.00	9.8%	5.8%	**-26.4%**	**-23.4%**	**-10.5%**	22.0%	-2.0%

† Outcomes have been adjusted for the following veteran characteristics: Age, race, marital status, education, previous employment history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses; including serious psychiatric illness and substance abuse problems.

†† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

††† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

†††† Only veterans with a problem in the clinical area were included in this analysis.

Table 35 cont. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY04 †, ††, †††, ††††

| | | Site Median Value | | 1.60 | 65.1% | 53.3% | 69.4% | 45.5% | 47.9% | 25.3% | 10.3% |
| | | Veteran Average | | 1.64 | 66.5% | 65.5% | 54.5% | 40.4% | 41.7% | 26.2% | 11.8% |

VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
20	463	Anchorage, AK	21	0.10	4.3%	-16.5%	-12.9%	32.3%	-7.4%	-5.8%	18.7%
20	648	Portland, OR	81	0.26	23.9%	46.8%	47.4%	69.3%	4.1%	4.7%	3.1%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	72	-0.50	-45.0%	-37.6%	-31.5%	-18.0%	-4.3%	-7.1%	-4.2%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	11	-0.58	-23.2%	-45.3%	-29.8%	-25.6%	3.1%	-5.2%	-8.9%
20	692	White City, OR	151	0.08	27.5%	34.8%	19.5%	24.1%	6.7%	-13.3%	-0.5%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	20	-0.18	-35.6%	-6.7%	-43.6%	2.3%	-13.7%	10.7%	11.3%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	75	0.03	11.4%	11.7%	-18.5%	4.9%	12.3%	0.0%	0.6%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	-0.75	-123.8%	-76.4%	-73.1%	36.0%	-32.4%	-23.3%	41.2%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	51	-0.08	-7.8%	-16.4%	-21.1%	-22.3%	2.6%	11.5%	-1.2%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	0.14	24.7%	26.8%	19.3%	48.3%	20.8%	-3.4%	-9.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	77	0.34	37.8%	36.4%	20.6%	27.8%	10.7%	-23.4%	1.8%
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	0.09	0.0%	11.5%	-14.2%	13.5%	-20.2%	5.1%	2.6%
22	691	West LA, CA	11	-0.18	-20.4%	-5.4%	1.1%	-28.6%	20.1%	-6.8%	-9.6%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	32	-0.07	-14.1%	-5.2%	13.6%	57.4%	-7.6%	-18.6%	12.7%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	76	0.17	32.9%	50.4%	38.1%	57.6%	12.8%	-11.2%	-1.1%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	58	-0.29	4.4%	-24.6%	-7.2%	-24.9%	-10.0%	-3.5%	16.6%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	271	0.00	9.8%	5.8%	-26.4%	-23.4%	-10.5%	22.0%	-2.0%

† Outcomes have been adjusted for the following veteran characteristics: Age, race, marital status, education, previous employment history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses; including serious psychiatric illness and substance abuse problems.

†† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 9, Lexington; VISN 10, Dayton and Columbus, VISN 12, Iron Mountain, VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Colorado Springs and Sheridan; VISN 20, Roseburg; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23; Fargo, Knoxville and Omaha.

††† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

†††† Only veterans with a problem in the clinical area were included in this analysis.

Table 36. Summary of Outliers by Site for FY04

VISN		SITE	N	VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC CRITICAL MONITOR	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
1	405	White River Junction, VT	25	0	0	0	0
1	518	Bedford, MA	248	0	2	8	10
1	523	Boston, MA	35	0	0	2	2
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	118	0	1	2	3
1	631	Northampton, MA	108	0	1	1	2
1	650	Providence, RI	70	0	4	6	10
1	689	West Haven, CT	85	0	1	0	1
2	528	Buffalo, NY	76	0	1	3	4
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	47	0	0	0	0
2	528A6	Bath, NY	69	0	0	2	2
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	54	0	0	2	2
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	0	1	3	4
3	526	Bronx, NY	120	0	0	2	2
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	14	0	3	2	5
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	269	0	0	0	0
3	620	Montrose, NY	121	0	1	5	6
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	78	0	1	5	6
3	632	Northport, NY	28	0	2	2	4
4	529	Butler, PA	49	0	0	2	2
4	542	Coatesville, PA	289	1	0	1	2
4	595	Lebanon, PA	75	1	0	1	2
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	124	0	1	1	2
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	10	0	0	0	0
5	512	Baltimore, MD	31	0	0	1	1
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	112	0	1	1	2
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	178	0	0	1	1
5	688	Washington, DC	83	0	0	0	0
6	590	Hampton, VA	51	1	0	1	2
6	637	Asheville, NC	21	0	2	1	3
6	652	Richmond, VA	22	0	0	5	5
6	658	Salem, VA	72	1	0	0	1
7	508	Atlanta, GA	173	0	0	2	2
7	509	Augusta, GA	96	0	1	1	2
7	521	Birmingham, AL	23	1	0	0	1
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	0	1	0	1
7	544	Columbia, SC	103	0	3	6	9
7	557	Dublin, GA	30	1	1	0	2
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	69	0	0	0	0
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	154	0	0	1	1
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	81	0	0	0	0
8	546	Miami, FL	40	0	0	1	1
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	47	0	0	0	0
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	0	0	0	0
8	673	Tampa, FL	102	1	0	1	2
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	64	1	0	0	1
9	614	Memphis, TN	32	1	1	2	4
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	85	0	1	1	2
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	67	0	2	3	5
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	201	0	2	0	2
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	136	0	1	0	1
10	541	Cleveland, OH	142	0	0	1	1

Table 36 cont. Summary of Outliers by Site for FY04

VISN		SITE	N	VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC CRITICAL MONITOR	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	29	0	**2**	**6**	**8**
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	53	0	0	1	1
11	550	**Danville, IL**	34	0	**2**	2	4
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	0	0	2	2
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	167	0	0	0	0
12	578	**Hines, IL**	76	0	1	2	3
12	607	**Madison, WI**	20	0	**2**	0	2
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	70	0	1	0	1
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	50	0	**2**	2	4
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	67	0	0	0	0
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	14	0	1	0	1
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	31	0	**3**	**4**	**7**
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	58	0	0	1	1
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	168	0	0	3	3
16	580	**Houston, TX**	184	0	0	**4**	4
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	38	**1**	1	3	**5**
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	128	**1**	0	2	3
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	78	0	1	2	3
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	422	0	**3**	**7**	**10**
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	39	0	0	0	0
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	0	**2**	2	4
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	36	0	0	1	1
17	674	**Temple, TX**	303	0	1	1	2
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	97	0	0	1	1
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	98	0	0	1	1
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	57	0	1	**4**	**5**
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	22	0	0	0	0
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	21	0	1	1	2
20	648	**Portland, OR**	81	0	0	0	0
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	72	0	**2**	**4**	**6**
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	11	0	1	1	2
20	692	**White City, OR**	151	0	0	0	0
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	20	0	**2**	1	3
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	75	**1**	0	0	1
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	0	**3**	**6**	**9**
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	51	0	0	1	1
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	0	0	0	0
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	77	0	0	0	0
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	68	0	1	1	2
22	691	**West LA, CA**	11	0	1	0	1
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	32	0	0	1	1
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	76	0	0	0	0
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	58	0	**2**	3	**5**
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	271	0	0	**4**	4
TOTAL				**12**	**71**	**153**	**236**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**0.1**	**0.7**	**1.6**	**2.5**
SITE S.D.				**0.3**	**1.0**	**1.8**	**2.5**

Table 37a. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement	FY02 Average Work Improvement	FY03 Average Work Improvement	FY04 Average Work Improvement
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***	***	0.03	0.03
1	518	Bedford, MA	-0.41	-0.39	-0.27	-0.34	-0.43	-0.49	-0.46	-0.43
1	523	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.23	-0.16	0.09	-0.28	0.06
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	0.18	0.08	-0.05	-0.21	-0.43	-0.36	0.02	0.11
1	608	Manchester, NH	-0.43	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	631	Northampton, MA	0.03	0.09	0.03	0.07	0.22	0.29	0.14	0.24
1	650	Providence, RI	-0.12	-0.08	-0.09	0.08	0.24	-0.42	-0.51	-0.62
1	689	West Haven, CT	-0.01	-0.11	0.21	-0.04	0.06	-0.46	-0.35	0.00
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-0.42	-0.50	-0.54	-0.47	-0.41	-0.30	-0.29	-0.43
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	0.00	-0.19	-0.01	0.08	-0.02	0.00	0.15	0.18
2	528A6	Bath, NY	0.48	0.42	0.39	0.19	0.22	0.32	-0.03	0.19
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	0.08	0.03	-0.24	0.00	-0.44	-0.51	-0.37	-0.21
2	528A8	Albany, NY	-0.34	-0.22	-0.09	0.04	-0.11	-0.25	-0.24	-0.13
3	526	Bronx, NY	0.01	0.42	0.07	0.15	0.08	-0.10	-0.13	-0.05
3	561	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	-0.01	0.01	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-0.08	0.23	*see above*	*see above*	0.30	0.28	-0.19	-0.26
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	0.12	0.28	*see above*	*see above*	0.32	0.32	0.26	0.32
3	620	Montrose, NY	-0.35	-0.10	-0.16	-0.11	-0.39	-0.45	-0.48	-0.43
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	-0.08	-0.10	-0.23	-0.38	-0.20	-0.20	-0.42
3	632	Northport, NY	0.08	0.23	0.10	***	-0.22	-0.01	-0.25	-0.42
4	529	Butler, PA	***	0.24	0.36	0.37	0.29	0.34	0.18	0.07
4	542	Coatesville, PA	0.04	0.24	0.31	0.27	0.26	0.24	0.23	0.22
4	595	Lebanon, PA	0.07	0.00	0.10	0.17	0.25	0.29	0.18	0.26
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	0.46	0.46	0.42	0.39	0.40	*program closed*	*program closed*
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-0.59	-0.14	0.05	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.23	0.25
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-0.20	-0.01	-0.07
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	0.17	0.32	-0.03	0.29	0.06	0.00	0.25
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	0.02	0.08	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	0.10	-0.12	0.25	***	-0.07	0.12	0.05	0.03
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	-0.08	0.01	0.20	0.26	0.06	0.17
5	688	Washington DC	-0.54	-0.31	-0.13	-0.28	-0.16	-0.10	-0.20	-0.11
6	558	Durham, NC	0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.23	0.25	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
6	590	Hampton, VA	0.18	-0.06	0.11	0.11	0.24	0.27	0.21	0.23
6	637	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	***	-0.05	-0.04	0.18	-0.32
6	652	Richmond, VA	-0.30	-0.28	-0.01	*program closed*	***	-0.52	-0.10	0.04
6	658	Salem, VA	-0.36	-0.62	0.16	0.28	0.33	0.21	0.29	0.34
6	659	Salisbury, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	0.16	-0.23	-0.37	-0.26	-0.32	-0.09	-0.19	-0.18
7	509	Augusta, GA	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.06
7	521	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	0.38	0.25	0.24	0.19	0.17	0.30
7	534	Charleston, SC	-0.21	0.09	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.12	0.16	0.23
7	544	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-0.22	-0.37	-0.44
7	557	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	0.09	***	0.31	0.26	0.21
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.24	-0.08	0.37	0.38
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	-0.05	0.11	0.02	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.09

Table 37a cont. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement	FY02 Average Work Improvement	FY03 Average Work Improvement	FY04 Average Work Improvement
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	-0.12	0.34	0.30	-0.05	-0.06	-0.09	-0.07	-0.01
8	546	Miami, FL	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.16
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-0.34	-0.24	-0.09	-0.18	-0.08	0.02
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	*see below*	*see below*	0.29	0.07	0.14	0.16	0.05	0.09
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	0.27	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	0.13	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	673	Tampa, FL	0.00	0.07	-0.03	0.02	-0.46	-0.34	-0.04	0.10
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								0.33
9	596	Lexington, KY	-0.39	-0.45	-0.57	-0.44	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	0.24	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.21	-0.09	-0.13
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-0.03	0.10	0.08	0.02	0.24	0.30	0.18	0.25
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	-0.43	-0.48	-0.48	-0.44	-0.49	-0.35	-0.34	-0.25
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	0.00	0.02	-0.20	-0.25	-0.31	0.27	0.22	0.22
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	0.31	0.17	0.01	0.17
10	541	Cleveland, OH	0.28	0.13	0.09	0.21	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.26
10	756	Columbus, OH								***
10	552	Dayton, OH	-0.54	***	-0.15	-0.32	***	-0.08	0.02	***
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	-0.65	-0.29	-0.42
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	-0.07	-0.05	-0.17	-0.21	-0.22	-0.40	-0.32	-0.10
11	550	Danville, IL	-0.16	***	-0.10	-0.26	-0.24	-0.03	0.06	-0.12
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	0.24	-0.18	-0.19	-0.19	-0.25	-0.24	-0.19
12	556	North Chicago, IL	-0.06	***	0.27	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.25	0.31
12	578	Hines, IL	-0.14	-0.59	-0.34	-0.28	-0.19	-0.12	-0.19	-0.07
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	Madison, WI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-0.08	0.06
12	676	Tomah, WI	-0.11	0.02	0.07	-0.59	0.28	0.17	0.20	0.10
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-0.29	0.02	0.10	-0.07	-0.03	0.01	-0.16	0.17
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-0.29	0.39	0.43	0.41	***	***	0.07	0.03
15	543	Columbia, MO	***	***	-0.78	***	***	***	***	-0.01
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-0.07	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	-0.19	-0.38	-0.44	-0.35
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	-0.13	-0.40	0.24	0.21	0.28	0.22	0.05	0.31
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-0.16	-0.07	-0.09	-0.01	-0.11	-0.09	0.02	0.05
16	580	Houston, TX	-0.40	0.32	0.26	0.27	0.21	0.05	0.07	0.05
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	-0.05	-0.05	0.17	0.05	-0.38	-0.47	-0.56
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-0.68	-0.19	-0.28	-0.31	-0.14	-0.15	-0.23	-0.27
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	-0.08	-0.14	***	-0.28	-0.23	-0.04	-0.07	-0.01
17	549	Dallas, TX	-0.08	0.08	-0.03	-0.10	-0.10	-0.12	-0.18	-0.39
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	0.23	0.25	0.26	0.19	0.22	0.16	0.27
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.16	-0.11	-0.08	0.00
17	671	San Antonio, TX	0.35	0.21	0.05	0.13	-0.18	-0.10	-0.33	0.07
17	674	Temple, TX	-0.09	0.06	-0.03	0.23	0.30	-0.04	0.03	0.05
17	674A4	Waco, TX	0.26	-0.22	***	***	0.27	***	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37a cont. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement	FY02 Average Work Improvement	FY03 Average Work Improvement	FY04 Average Work Improvement
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-0.33	0.17	-0.06	-0.03
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	***	-0.09	0.18	0.00	program closed	program closed	program closed
18	649	Prescott, AZ	0.21	0.11	0.22	-0.03	0.11	0.13	0.00	0.10
18	678	Tucson, AZ	-0.09	-0.22	-0.02	0.01	-0.16	0.02	-0.11	-0.24
18	756	El Paso	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	0.22	0.23	0.25	0.15	-0.21	0.04	0.03	0.10
19	666	Sheridan, WY	n.a.	-0.37	-0.33	0.32	***	***	-0.11	***
20	463	Anchorage, AK	-0.37	-0.01	-0.02	0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.18	0.10
20	648	Portland, OR	-0.03	0.20	0.37	0.35	0.31	0.25	0.24	0.26
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-0.30	-0.23	-0.05	0.10	-0.27	***	0.21	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-0.20	-0.30	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	0.00	-0.05	0.19	-0.03	-0.14	-0.35	-0.41	-0.50
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-0.55	-0.63	-0.58
20	692	White City, OR	-0.11	-0.03	-0.03	0.14	0.14	0.19	0.08	0.08
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	0.21	-0.25	0.07	0.13	-0.18
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	-0.28	-0.17	-0.07	-0.01	-0.26	-0.14	0.03
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	-0.30	-0.55	***	-0.65	-0.75
21	662	San Francisco, CA	-0.13	-0.35	-0.15	-0.28	-0.51	-0.32	-0.18	-0.08
22	600	Long Beach, CA	-0.08	0.26	0.26	0.08	0.25	0.19	0.07	0.14
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	0.37	0.31	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.29	0.34
22	664	San Diego, CA	n.a.	***	-0.18	-0.02	0.07	0.25	0.12	0.09
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	-0.13	0.10	***	0.00	-0.09	-0.18
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437	Fargo, ND						n.a.	***	***
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-0.05	-0.19	***	***
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	-0.02	-0.39	0.39	0.44	0.37	0.30	0.19	-0.07
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	0.46	0.42	0.30	0.36	0.29	0.25	0.28	0.17
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-0.09	-0.34	-0.57	-0.03	-0.29
23	636	Omaha, NE								***
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	n.a.	***	0.06	0.19	***	***	program closed	program closed
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	-0.08	-0.41	0.04	0.30	0.39	0.30	0.40	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.01	-0.13	-0.03	0.00	0.00

† Average work improvement has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37b. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year†, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY02 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY03 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY04 Alcohol Problems Improved %
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***	***	6.5%	20.4%
1	518	Bedford, MA	**-32.0%**	**-32.0%**	**-26.6%**	**-32.8%**	**-34.2%**	**-46.0%**	**-41.3%**	**-34.6%**
1	523	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-69.3%**	**-27.4%**	-28.9%	**-51.8%**	-24.7%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	31.1%	22.6%	-2.9%	0.0%	1.2%	-20.4%	15.9%	31.4%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-30.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	631	Northampton, MA	1.1%	6.1%	4.2%	12.9%	14.0%	14.9%	13.8%	13.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	18.2%	-5.5%	**-32.7%**	24.8%	24.3%	-30.1%	**-34.7%**	**-50.5%**
1	689	West Haven, CT	**-29.2%**	-20.4%	27.4%	1.8%	8.8%	**-47.2%**	**-35.0%**	9.1%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-17.0%	-21.6%	**-54.6%**	-19.0%	-13.7%	**-35.0%**	-11.2%	-8.5%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	40.7%	0.0%	4.7%	22.8%	-16.5%	5.1%	12.4%	19.4%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	20.7%	65.9%	46.2%	38.7%	33.7%	38.7%	8.2%	41.4%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-19.4%	21.0%	**-42.7%**	1.2%	**-41.0%**	**-54.0%**	-13.0%	-26.7%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	**-35.6%**	-9.3%	-7.3%	-9.1%	-11.4%	**-27.6%**	**-22.9%**	-17.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-43.6%	38.8%	8.9%	15.1%	16.1%	9.0%	0.6%	30.2%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	21.1%	-5.0%	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-24.1%	48.0%	*see above*	15.9%	24.7%	23.5%	-21.1%	23.0%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	9.2%	55.5%	*see above*	*see above*	13.6%	33.2%	35.5%	47.2%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-23.9%	0.8%	-2.8%	*see above*	**-29.5%**	**-37.2%**	**-36.0%**	**-29.1%**
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	***	-3.4%	6.6%	-4.3%	**-26.1%**	**-45.6%**	-9.1%	**-33.6%**
3	632	Northport, NY	-17.1%	29.8%	-1.6%	***	-11.3%	-19.7%	9.6%	-28.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	54.9%	52.7%	44.3%	47.1%	42.5%	33.1%	27.3%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	27.5%	46.7%	39.8%	42.1%	35.6%	33.2%	35.5%	46.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	0.0%	15.3%	28.5%	22.8%	30.4%	32.9%	15.8%	44.1%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	61.3%	57.4%	35.7%	22.3%	43.3%	*program closed*	*program closed*
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	**-42.0%**	9.6%	14.9%	5.3%	13.6%	-12.7%	11.1%	34.2%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	0.0%	8.7%	7.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	25.5%	31.2%	7.5%	-24.5%	9.5%	-9.1%	-11.2%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	16.3%	14.8%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	34.4%	-6.8%	27.5%	***	40.3%	36.9%	30.7%	41.5%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	***	***	1.2%	4.5%	18.3%	29.3%	6.1%	23.7%
5	688	Washington DC	**-39.3%**	-5.1%	-1.4%	**-25.3%**	-5.8%	**-40.7%**	-6.7%	-12.5%
6	558	Durham, NC	55.0%	15.8%	14.2%	***	16.2%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
6	590	Hampton, VA	11.5%	-0.7%	7.5%	3.2%	27.1%	13.9%	24.0%	35.6%
6	637	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-15.2%	-35.0%	40.6%	-12.3%
6	652	Richmond, VA	**-60.9%**	-29.0%	-30.5%	*program closed*	***	**-106.0%**	**-66.9%**	**-44.4%**
6	658	Salem, VA	-14.9%	**-89.9%**	28.0%	30.8%	29.6%	19.3%	21.2%	28.5%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-5.5%	**-22.6%**	**-34.4%**	-0.1%	-15.6%	-1.9%	-20.0%	-17.3%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-8.9%	-33.4%	-12.4%	-10.7%	-23.0%	-14.2%	-22.6%	-2.4%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	50.6%	12.9%	39.3%	0.0%	28.6%	43.8%
7	534	Charleston, SC	18.2%	33.5%	20.7%	29.4%	-8.1%	13.4%	17.7%	24.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	**-49.4%**	**-34.0%**	**-24.2%**
7	557	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	32.1%	***	41.8%	29.3%	23.4%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-74.0%**	-10.2%	48.0%	54.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	-11.2%	11.4%	-5.3%	-6.2%	28.7%	0.5%	15.9%	18.7%

Table 37b cont. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY02 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY03 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY04 Alcohol Problems Improved %
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	3.7%	39.8%	35.8%	**-42.1%**	**-35.4%**	-23.4%	-14.6%	-8.1%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	-10.3%	-11.7%	12.6%	30.4%	16.2%	-3.2%	14.3%	25.8%
8	548	**W. Palm Beach, FL**	*n.a.*	***	-25.9%	-24.8%	-3.2%	-18.0%	-0.4%	7.3%
8	573	**N.FL/S.GA VHS**	*see below*	*see below*	31.7%	11.9%	3.8%	25.6%	4.5%	32.5%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	57.0%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	32.8%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	-4.4%	14.2%	-2.4%	8.7%	0.4%	-5.9%	27.4%	36.4%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**								52.8%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	-18.7%	-23.8%	**-68.8%**	**-32.0%**	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	***	11.3%	20.6%	2.1%	5.3%	13.9%	-15.0%	-22.6%
9	621	**Mt. Home, TN**	**-46.6%**	**-27.3%**	**-24.6%**	**-23.1%**	35.6%	27.3%	28.7%	29.8%
9	622	**Murfreesboro, TN**	**-38.0%**	**-44.4%**	**-36.2%**	**-25.4%**	**-39.5%**	-22.4%	**-35.3%**	-21.4%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	2.1%	17.1%	-9.9%	-17.6%	0.0%	32.1%	31.1%	42.0%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	45.3%	23.1%	5.2%	12.0%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	34.3%	16.2%	0.0%	8.2%	12.4%	-6.8%	19.7%	28.6%
10	765	**Columbus, OH**							***	***
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	-10.6%	***	-21.7%	0.0%	**-41.3%**	-0.9%	4.2%	***
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	-45.8%	**-64.4%**	**-56.9%**
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	-12.5%	9.2%	-6.5%	-14.2%	-1.2%	-26.7%	-13.9%	2.6%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	0.9%	***	-4.0%	-30.1%	**-41.3%**	**-42.4%**	-16.1%	-8.2%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	*n.a.*	-28.5%	**-46.7%**	**-42.6%**	**-33.6%**	**-31.3%**	-22.4%	-22.1%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	12.4%	***	13.4%	25.6%	27.8%	21.5%	20.3%	33.1%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	9.1%	**-32.9%**	-11.6%	**-29.2%**	**-21.2%**	**-31.5%**	-19.9%	18.0%
12	585	**Iron Mountain, MI**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	**Madison, WI**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	31.6%	-1.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	**-46.7%**	16.4%	5.1%	**-49.2%**	22.2%	32.6%	8.4%	-8.8%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	-18.6%	11.7%	42.9%	9.4%	19.3%	5.8%	-14.5%	25.5%
15	589	**Kansas City, KS**	**-34.6%**	9.7%	-2.0%	21.7%	***	***	-8.1%	-5.6%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	***	***	**-49.9%**	***	***	***	***	-6.3%
15	647	**Poplar Bluff, MO**	***	52.7%	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	**St. Louis, MO**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
15	677	**Topeka, KS**	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	**-56.4%**	**-71.4%**	**-52.4%**	**-32.2%**
15	677A4	**Leavenworth, KS**	**-36.9%**	-2.8%	**-27.2%**	-10.8%	-17.6%	-21.5%	6.7%	33.4%
16	520	**Biloxi, MI**	**-50.4%**	32.4%	17.8%	0.6%	17.1%	8.7%	-10.2%	-8.4%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	**-27.6%**	44.4%	26.7%	40.5%	23.1%	-7.7%	**-38.3%**	**-28.4%**
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	***	16.3%	-16.0%	**-39.7%**	**-56.8%**	**-85.9%**	**-53.7%**	-8.6%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	**-72.8%**	-4.0%	**-16.8%**	-2.8%	1.5%	4.6%	-14.0%	-2.9%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	-12.6%	-2.1%	***	14.7%	-4.5%	24.6%	35.6%	18.1%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	-8.4%	14.0%	7.1%	-1.2%	-3.5%	-13.8%	**-25.7%**	**-30.4%**
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	***	-3.1%	1.7%	18.7%	27.9%	18.7%	26.6%	37.5%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-6.0%	-15.3%	-9.7%	-0.6%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	8.0%	4.4%	-14.6%	-11.9%	-19.6%	-38.1%	-5.3%	-8.6%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	31.2%	13.8%	-23.8%	-28.5%	11.5%	-11.4%	-13.8%	0.5%
17	674A4	**Waco, TX**	25.6%	-2.5%	***	***	-27.8%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37b cont. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY02 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY03 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY04 Alcohol Problems Improved %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-29.6%	-2.4%	**-37.8%**	-2.9%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	**-44.0%**	-10.4%	**-40.7%**	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
18	649	Prescott, AZ	55.4%	41.7%	40.1%	18.9%	4.0%	24.5%	10.0%	36.9%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	5.4%	**-26.2%**	3.3%	0.8%	**-37.5%**	**-58.1%**	**-27.6%**	-16.9%
18	756	El Paso	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-28.5%	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	36.7%	-3.2%	***	30.2%	**-62.2%**	14.2%	**-45.7%**	7.9%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-12.0%	**-57.0%**	-18.1%	***	***	**-90.5%**	***
20	463	Anchorage, AK	**-45.7%**	-14.3%	-9.8%	25.7%	4.9%	**24.0%**	2.1%	4.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	3.3%	-2.3%	23.1%	44.7%	29.2%	5.0%	7.0%	23.9%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	**-38.8%**	-42.2%	-19.1%	-26.1%	**-64.2%**	***	-37.9%	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-39.0%	-32.8%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	6.4%	-16.4%	4.4%	-4.3%	-31.2%	-6.0%	**-25.5%**	**-45.0%**
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	15.3%	**-67.8%**	-23.2%
20	692	White City, OR	**-37.4%**	5.9%	-11.1%	10.1%	18.7%	0.2%	18.9%	27.5%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	14.5%	-21.9%	3.8%	-8.7%	-35.6%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	-15.3%	1.6%	-8.0%	-2.9%	-17.6%	-13.1%	11.4%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	-19.5%	***	**-83.6%**	**-123.8%**
21	662	San Francisco, CA	**-25.1%**	-19.9%	**-21.2%**	-19.9%	**-35.0%**	**-51.5%**	**-24.9%**	-7.8%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	**-39.5%**	40.9%	19.1%	-7.1%	18.9%	0.6%	1.2%	24.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	49.8%	46.5%	28.7%	22.3%	20.5%	18.8%	30.1%	37.8%
22	664	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	27.1%	6.0%	47.5%	5.6%	0.4%	0.0%
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	-22.7%	-9.7%	***	***	4.3%	-20.4%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	9.5%	***	***
23	437	Fargo, ND						*n.a.*	***	***
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-4.2%	11.0%	***	***
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	3.9%	**-47.3%**	54.4%	54.8%	48.3%	20.7%	-6.6%	-14.1%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	27.9%	25.1%	2.4%	-3.8%	12.8%	-1.0%	0.0%	32.9%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	50.4%	48.0%	***	7.1%	4.4%
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	2.7%	45.1%	***	29.6%	*program closed*	*program closed*
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	-1.4%	**-38.1%**	9.6%	25.9%	32.9%	-19.7%	47.4%	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	3.8%	6.9%	16.1%	2.2%	-18.2%	-5.5%	7.9%	9.8%

† Improvement in alcohol problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37c. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %	FY02 Drug Problems Improved %	FY03 Drug Problems Improved %	FY04 Drug Problems Improved %
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	n.a.	***	***	program closed	***	***	-21.8%	15.2%
1	518	Bedford, MA	**-26.4%**	**-28.1%**	**-20.1%**	-29.6%	**-26.0%**	**-46.3%**	**-43.1%**	**-25.0%**
1	523	Boston, MA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-64.8%	-3.9%	**-36.6%**	-33.3%	-23.8%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	40.4%	24.7%	-12.8%	4.2%	-9.8%	-1.3%	11.8%	31.7%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-20.6%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
1	631	Northampton, MA	2.1%	15.0%	10.6%	14.9%	38.3%	26.5%	21.8%	20.7%
1	650	Providence, RI	30.9%	0.1%	9.4%	28.7%	34.9%	-35.6%	-23.8%	**-55.9%**
1	689	West Haven, CT	-18.6%	-20.5%	26.0%	-9.9%	23.5%	**-46.8%**	**-42.5%**	12.5%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	**-26.9%**	**-42.4%**	**-61.1%**	-24.8%	-7.9%	**-37.5%**	3.0%	-11.2%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	30.2%	**-31.1%**	-3.6%	7.1%	-21.0%	-13.8%	10.8%	9.1%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	47.3%	62.1%	52.5%	35.8%	36.5%	39.8%	3.5%	41.3%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-21.4%	10.3%	**-27.6%**	11.3%	**-43.4%**	**-52.2%**	-11.5%	**-44.1%**
2	528A8	Albany, NY	-19.9%	2.3%	-12.6%	-11.9%	0.0%	**-31.4%**	**-36.9%**	-18.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	**-54.2%**	25.5%	-2.7%	-13.9%	5.4%	**-20.9%**	**-29.4%**	5.8%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	see below	see below	26.1%	15.0%	see below	see below	see below	see below
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-22.4%	43.4%	see above	see above	11.4%	19.0%	-6.4%	38.2%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	15.7%	54.1%	see above	see above	10.2%	39.1%	31.8%	47.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-15.8%	0.1%	-4.5%	-11.5%	**-30.2%**	**-37.3%**	**-38.4%**	**-32.4%**
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	n.a.	-6.5%	-1.1%	-8.3%	**-27.0%**	**-51.2%**	-16.5%	**-25.5%**
3	632	Northport, NY	-0.2%	29.7%	12.5%	***	-10.1%	-13.1%	16.4%	-28.8%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	49.3%	42.1%	46.2%	17.9%	44.2%	35.8%	29.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	35.4%	47.1%	41.3%	37.0%	39.6%	34.3%	37.2%	38.7%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	16.0%	21.2%	20.8%	27.3%	31.5%	3.0%	14.4%	35.3%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	63.7%	59.8%	36.7%	-0.2%	47.0%	program closed	program closed
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	**-34.7%**	5.6%	17.6%	0.0%	22.6%	-3.9%	15.6%	31.6%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	11.0%	3.0%	-24.1%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-4.2%	48.1%	18.7%	-16.5%	8.7%	3.6%	-8.6%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	n.a.	***	20.6%	-5.4%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	10.3%	-17.1%	45.9%	***	43.0%	39.8%	32.9%	39.2%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	n.a.	***	7.5%	6.2%	19.1%	32.2%	4.3%	27.1%
5	688	Washington DC	**-44.4%**	-9.2%	-20.1%	**-50.5%**	-20.6%	**-33.0%**	-12.1%	-11.4%
6	558	Durham, NC	50.1%	2.4%	19.5%	***	19.8%	***	program closed	program closed
6	590	Hampton, VA	0.0%	**-17.5%**	7.5%	-6.0%	33.2%	18.8%	19.7%	40.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	***	-12.5%	-19.5%	38.8%	-19.3%
6	652	Richmond, VA	**-64.3%**	-23.1%	-23.1%	program closed	***	-24.6%	**-98.6%**	**-36.2%**
6	658	Salem, VA	-13.5%	**-102.9%**	14.6%	27.1%	26.1%	25.9%	35.9%	47.0%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-5.4%	**-28.8%**	**-38.0%**	-0.2%	-7.9%	0.0%	-19.0%	**-19.6%**
7	509	Augusta, GA	-22.9%	-30.0%	-17.9%	-12.8%	-13.4%	-15.0%	**-37.1%**	-5.4%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	n.a.	n.a.	36.5%	19.6%	33.6%	10.2%	28.6%	37.9%
7	534	Charleston, SC	40.1%	8.8%	-17.1%	32.1%	**-37.6%**	-3.9%	5.9%	-0.8%
7	544	Columbia, SC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	**-32.6%**	**-40.5%**	**-36.0%**
7	557	Dublin, GA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	36.3%	***	43.7%	26.8%	49.5%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	**-90.4%**	-19.6%	48.5%	54.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	-10.9%	8.7%	-11.4%	-2.1%	**-33.5%**	-9.7%	3.5%	21.7%

Table 37c cont. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %	FY02 Drug Problems Improved %	FY03 Drug Problems Improved %	FY04 Drug Problems Improved %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	31.9%	48.1%	39.0%	-26.0%	-12.8%	-36.3%	-12.8%	-2.9%
8	546	Miami, FL	-22.4%	-21.4%	-14.8%	-2.9%	3.5%	7.6%	10.5%	22.2%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	-28.3%	***	3.6%	-22.0%	0.0%	8.1%
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	see below	see below	16.3%	1.0%	5.8%	16.1%	-2.4%	20.9%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	49.7%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	5.9%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	673	Tampa, FL	-3.3%	29.2%	-39.3%	10.2%	-7.6%	-7.9%	18.7%	40.4%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								44.7%
9	596	Lexington, KY	-8.4%	-26.0%	-47.5%	-41.5%	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	11.4%	20.3%	10.0%	2.9%	23.5%	-26.8%	-21.3%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-24.3%	-20.7%	-45.4%	-55.6%	39.7%	26.4%	26.9%	33.3%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	-32.1%	-44.2%	-32.1%	-23.9%	-37.8%	-24.2%	-48.4%	-20.2%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	4.1%	16.2%	3.5%	-27.4%	7.3%	32.6%	26.1%	40.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	48.5%	24.3%	-0.3%	12.2%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	41.4%	17.5%	6.1%	10.2%	15.3%	0.6%	13.2%	30.6%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***
10	552	Dayton, OH	-0.5%	***	-33.2%	-2.7%	-31.9%	0.4%	-37.0%	***
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	n.a.	***	***	***	***	-42.6%	-94.8%	-57.6%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	-17.4%	0.2%	-12.8%	-24.6%	-14.3%	-27.1%	-26.8%	-3.1%
11	550	Danville, IL	10.0%	***	-14.6%	-34.0%	-31.9%	-31.1%	-6.9%	-38.7%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	n.a.	17.8%	-37.5%	-56.7%	-69.6%	-21.1%	-23.1%	-32.3%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	8.9%	***	10.7%	27.6%	28.7%	24.2%	16.1%	29.7%
12	578	Hines, IL	12.4%	-33.0%	-18.2%	-26.6%	-19.8%	-19.2%	-44.2%	10.1%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	program closed	
12	607	Madison, WI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	40.7%	-10.2%
12	676	Tomah, WI	-24.1%	12.2%	12.2%	-42.2%	18.1%	7.4%	-20.3%	1.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-6.7%	8.7%	41.0%	1.7%	6.0%	-21.3%	-10.8%	30.1%
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-32.2%	9.3%	4.7%	11.8%	***	***	-9.1%	-5.6%
15	543	Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	17.3%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-41.1%	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	see below	see below	see below	see below	-37.2%	-67.1%	-52.4%	-46.9%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	-47.6%	-33.1%	-23.2%	-9.0%	-21.5%	-21.1%	3.0%	33.3%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-38.0%	30.3%	14.1%	20.3%	29.4%	5.7%	2.7%	-11.6%
16	580	Houston, TX	-24.3%	51.8%	31.2%	40.9%	33.8%	-13.9%	-37.0%	-28.4%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	-47.2%	-32.0%	-34.5%	-73.5%	-86.1%	-72.7%	-10.9%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-68.2%	-0.2%	-11.8%	-7.8%	8.1%	11.8%	-16.5%	-8.2%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	34.6%	-10.3%	***	-9.6%	-7.9%	-1.7%	7.0%	18.4%
17	549	Dallas, TX	-15.5%	0.0%	-5.5%	-12.3%	-13.4%	-22.5%	-39.6%	-41.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	n.a.	43.0%	18.7%	19.9%	25.5%	3.5%	4.9%	16.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2.4%	-13.8%	-8.7%	0.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	-19.0%	-38.7%	***	7.8%	-8.4%	-22.5%	-27.5%	-14.6%
17	674	Temple, TX	20.3%	-6.0%	1.7%	-8.8%	-9.8%	-2.6%	-13.4%	-6.2%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	41.2%	-20.8%	***	***	-10.3%	***	program closed	program closed

Table 37c cont. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %	FY02 Drug Problems Improved %	FY03 Drug Problems Improved %	FY04 Drug Problems Improved %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-36.9%	18.3%	**-32.6%**	15.3%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	***	***	**-33.5%**	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
18	649	Prescott, AZ	38.2%	53.6%	52.9%	31.5%	45.6%	44.8%	25.0%	42.7%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	13.3%	-43.5%	0.5%	-3.8%	**-41.2%**	**-52.5%**	**-33.1%**	-9.9%
18	756	El Paso	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-29.7%	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	13.8%	61.1%	***	***	-28.4%	-41.4%	-26.1%	24.7%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-14.3%	-29.8%	***	***	***	**-49.4%**	***
20	463	Anchorage, AK	-25.7%	-13.1%	-1.7%	19.9%	16.0%	8.6%	23.2%	-16.5%
20	648	Portland, OR	-11.3%	26.3%	37.0%	35.5%	39.3%	23.7%	20.2%	46.8%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-21.5%	-25.0%	-17.7%	-18.6%	**-38.9%**	***	-3.8%	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-10.9%	-54.3%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	26.9%	-12.8%	6.7%	-14.7%	**-36.7%**	**-41.3%**	**-34.1%**	**-37.6%**
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-30.7%	**-53.2%**	-45.3%
20	692	White City, OR	-21.4%	11.5%	0.0%	13.3%	18.7%	28.0%	17.3%	34.8%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	37.1%	22.0%	24.8%	-53.8%	-6.7%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	-26.1%	19.7%	0.5%	-1.4%	-20.3%	**-27.1%**	11.7%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	-37.3%	***	**-66.6%**	**-76.4%**
21	662	San Francisco, CA	-20.5%	-16.3%	**-24.9%**	**-29.2%**	**-35.9%**	**-45.3%**	-17.1%	-16.4%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	-33.0%	28.7%	19.3%	-2.4%	36.0%	-1.0%	-7.1%	26.8%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	54.5%	45.7%	30.8%	18.3%	18.3%	23.0%	26.9%	36.4%
22	664	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	***	26.8%	61.7%	34.1%	-14.9%	11.5%
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	-26.6%	-4.1%	***	-2.8%	3.4%	-5.4%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437	Fargo, ND	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-39.9%	22.5%	***	***
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	-7.0%	**-32.7%**	33.0%	41.9%	29.3%	13.2%	3.2%	-5.2%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	53.6%	28.4%	***	28.5%	39.0%	35.4%	17.4%	50.4%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	51.8%	18.9%	-3.1%	-24.6%
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	-7.6%	37.1%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	-0.8%	**-36.5%**	-1.7%	21.0%	55.5%	42.9%	45.7%	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	2.6%	9.8%	2.4%	-0.8%	-12.0%	**-24.8%**	-0.1%	5.8%

† Improvement in drug problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37d. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY98 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY99 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY00 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY01 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY02 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY03 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY04 Mental Health Problems Improved %
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***	***	37.9%	32.5%
1	518	Bedford, MA	**-20.3%**	-19.3%	**-33.4%**	**-36.3%**	**-41.4%**	**-55.8%**	**-43.6%**	**-44.4%**
1	523	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-86.8%**	**-42.4%**	**-49.3%**	**-64.8%**	**-37.8%**
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	15.1%	14.8%	-17.3%	*1.7%*	-15.4%	-12.6%	7.7%	4.9%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-23.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	631	Northampton, MA	-3.7%	4.3%	-8.5%	**-26.8%**	2.0%	9.5%	10.8%	23.4%
1	650	Providence, RI	-19.4%	**-22.8%**	-7.4%	24.0%	21.3%	**-37.1%**	-28.8%	**-51.1%**
1	689	West Haven, CT	-13.0%	-9.1%	9.0%	-15.3%	-0.5%	**-37.2%**	**-32.1%**	-7.8%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-21.7%	-14.2%	**-47.6%**	**-45.9%**	**-41.7%**	**-39.8%**	-25.3%	**-42.8%**
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	-2.1%	3.8%	14.3%	***	13.4%	7.5%	17.7%	-4.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	43.9%	79.0%	55.9%	40.3%	34.6%	46.9%	20.2%	42.7%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-11.5%	11.8%	**-38.8%**	-16.9%	**-61.4%**	**-52.0%**	0.0%	-22.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	**-48.4%**	1.0%	-3.4%	-13.0%	**-33.3%**	**-37.2%**	**-36.1%**	**-45.8%**
3	526	Bronx, NY	-42.2%	47.9%	16.9%	**-46.1%**	22.1%	**-37.6%**	-9.4%	**-27.0%**
3	561	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	-2.7%	**-33.6%**	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-19.4%	65.7%	*see above*	*see above*	4.7%	10.1%	-11.8%	**-47.6%**
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	20.7%	61.1%	*see above*	*see above*	12.4%	41.9%	44.4%	45.9%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-9.5%	-0.9%	**-18.3%**	*-11.3%*	**-52.8%**	**-48.4%**	**-42.0%**	**-54.2%**
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	0.0%	0.0%	*-12.8%*	**-32.8%**	**-36.6%**	-18.3%	**-39.4%**
3	632	Northport, NY	-9.9%	-1.3%	-21.6%	***	-19.4%	-8.7%	-5.0%	**-42.2%**
4	529	Butler, PA	***	48.1%	60.5%	34.5%	37.9%	37.4%	26.7%	0.2%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	16.7%	47.9%	36.5%	14.5%	19.2%	19.4%	17.8%	23.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	2.2%	10.0%	11.4%	**-35.1%**	8.8%	15.7%	0.7%	28.6%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	71.5%	62.1%	33.2%	26.5%	51.4%	*program closed*	*program closed*
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	**-30.5%**	-10.5%	-13.5%	-11.3%	26.6%	16.2%	36.2%	19.7%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-11.9%	12.6%	-6.5%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	0.3%	14.8%	-20.3%	26.9%	-6.6%	-15.2%	-21.2%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	-10.3%	-38.2%	33.4%	***	0.8%	18.7%	15.8%	15.1%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	-10.2%	-0.7%	6.0%	34.7%	5.5%	8.9%
5	688	Washington DC	**-33.7%**	-23.7%	-29.0%	**-46.8%**	-16.0%	-11.9%	-24.5%	-9.7%
6	558	Durham, NC	32.2%	32.5%	***	***	49.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
6	590	Hampton, VA	-7.4%	-17.9%	22.3%	**-21.0%**	0.0%	9.9%	16.5%	7.8%
6	637	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	**-48.1%**	32.3%	40.6%	-26.7%
6	652	Richmond, VA	**-60.3%**	**-57.1%**	-5.7%	*program closed*	***	**-111.1%**	**-48.8%**	**-88.1%**
6	658	Salem, VA	-28.6%	-35.8%	21.0%	17.0%	42.6%	19.2%	50.1%	50.8%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	4.4%	-6.2%	-18.7%	15.7%	-11.4%	9.4%	-8.8%	-8.4%
7	509	Augusta, GA	10.8%	-20.2%	-7.1%	-5.2%	-5.4%	-14.4%	-19.5%	-6.5%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	40.6%	50.5%	-28.9%	33.1%	48.6%
7	534	Charleston, SC	-0.7%	36.0%	7.6%	1.3%	-14.8%	**-32.6%**	22.2%	30.5%
7	544	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-27.7%	**-46.0%**	**-26.7%**
7	557	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	33.8%	29.1%	30.1%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-56.6%**	-9.1%	52.9%	51.8%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	4.9%	7.6%	-7.6%	-10.8%	18.8%	1.2%	14.3%	10.5%

Table 37d cont. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY98 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY99 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY00 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY01 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY02 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY03 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY04 Mental Health Problems Improved %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	12.3%	63.5%	49.6%	-27.8%	-41.2%	-28.1%	7.0%	-12.8%
8	546	Miami, FL	14.8%	-0.3%	-2.5%	0.0%	-7.5%	-12.2%	-7.3%	17.6%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-31.9%	-31.6%	-21.0%	-20.5%	-13.6%	14.9%
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	*see below*	*see below*	16.4%	16.4%	-3.7%	12.1%	-22.5%	16.4%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	34.0%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	-9.7%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	673	Tampa, FL	-20.7%	21.1%	-27.1%	-4.2%	-22.2%	-17.3%	5.5%	2.8%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								45.3%
9	596	Lexington, KY	-17.7%	-33.0%	-34.8%	-48.6%	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	8.9%	***	-0.2%	-9.7%	20.8%	-19.2%	-5.8%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-21.6%	-7.4%	-36.4%	-45.7%	26.0%	24.5%	33.0%	28.6%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	-30.4%	-31.3%	-39.3%	-52.9%	-52.4%	-38.2%	-49.9%	-51.4%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	0.0%	5.7%	-15.2%	-26.7%	-22.6%	27.5%	36.6%	34.5%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	45.2%	25.8%	17.2%	16.8%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	-10.7%	12.2%	-19.2%	21.9%	31.1%	9.5%	32.8%	25.1%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***
10	552	Dayton, OH	-40.5%	***	0.3%	***	-19.6%	-11.4%	-13.6%	***
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	-40.7%	-33.3%	-42.5%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	-8.1%	7.7%	-23.7%	-23.6%	-24.5%	-46.8%	-45.4%	-27.8%
11	550	Danville, IL	24.9%	***	11.3%	-12.5%	-19.6%	-21.2%	-12.0%	-18.5%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	31.2%	-44.3%	-42.4%	-21.4%	-14.1%	-30.6%	-7.2%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	11.6%	***	-5.8%	11.3%	7.1%	3.9%	12.5%	16.1%
12	578	Hines, IL	-19.4%	-48.3%	-30.4%	-28.8%	-28.7%	-51.3%	-55.6%	-25.2%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	Madison, WI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	12.1%	-3.4%
12	676	Tomah, WI	-34.8%	-18.1%	7.9%	-52.4%	12.5%	14.5%	15.3%	-13.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-25.3%	4.8%	28.1%	15.7%	9.7%	13.6%	8.4%	32.8%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	-13.7%
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-21.5%	21.7%	6.6%	23.8%	***	***	8.0%	-5.5%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	55.4%	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	-45.7%	-54.5%	-61.6%	-19.6%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	-39.9%	-12.1%	-7.1%	-12.5%	-18.0%	-11.4%	21.6%	31.7%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-28.6%	33.0%	23.3%	-16.1%	8.7%	4.0%	-8.1%	-23.1%
16	580	Houston, TX	-21.4%	53.1%	34.6%	40.0%	22.9%	-12.0%	-21.8%	-23.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	-15.5%	***	-10.0%	-113.5%	-26.5%	-40.0%	-38.2%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-57.1%	-2.3%	-23.9%	-33.4%	-25.6%	-34.6%	-37.5%	-41.9%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	-65.4%	12.6%	***	-75.5%	-60.5%	-69.1%	-22.8%	-60.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	-17.1%	6.6%	-10.1%	-12.9%	-14.3%	-22.4%	-40.0%	-51.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	34.3%	29.9%	24.3%	27.9%	3.6%	9.2%	25.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.5%	-5.4%	3.6%	11.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	-8.3%	-14.2%	7.6%	***	-39.3%	-18.5%	-37.9%	-24.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	8.1%	-1.0%	-5.5%	***	-2.4%	-22.1%	6.2%	6.7%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	30.0%	-7.9%	***	***	26.3%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37d cont. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY98 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY99 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY00 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY01 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY02 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY03 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY04 Mental Health Problems Improved %
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	**-86.1%**	2.6%	**-36.5%**	-14.2%
18	644	**Phoenix, AZ**	*n.a.*	***	-32.0%	-22.8%	-22.3%	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	29.9%	19.3%	35.3%	7.6%	16.1%	0.0%	9.0%	0.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	-22.8%	**-36.3%**	-10.9%	-3.7%	**-64.4%**	-28.1%	**-32.0%**	**-28.8%**
18	756	**El Paso**	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE	**Col. Springs, CO**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-4.8%	***
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	24.8%	44.9%	2.4%	41.5%	-19.3%	10.2%	-2.9%	-4.7%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	*n.a.*	-8.6%	**-48.2%**	***	***	***	-23.2%	
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	**-47.9%**	-3.2%	-16.0%	10.0%	22.0%	-0.7%	12.5%	-12.9%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	**-29.1%**	**-79.9%**	50.8%	38.7%	38.3%	23.4%	39.5%	47.4%
20	653	**Roseburg, OR**	-0.6%	**-54.6%**	-28.5%	2.7%	-27.3%	***	11.8%	***
20	663	**Seattle, WA**	**-41.1%**	-10.3%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
20	663A4	**Am. Lake, WA**	13.8%	**-24.1%**	2.9%	0.0%	-14.0%	-20.7%	-28.6%	**-31.5%**
20	687	**Walla Walla, WA**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-28.0%	-16.4%	-29.8%
20	692	**White City, OR**	-18.7%	17.3%	-13.0%	1.9%	17.8%	7.9%	6.3%	19.5%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	***	***	***	28.2%	-26.6%	0.0%	-28.5%	**-43.6%**
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	***	**-26.7%**	-25.8%	-26.4%	-1.3%	-25.4%	-27.4%	-18.5%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	***	***	***	5.3%	**-49.4%**	***	**-58.2%**	**-73.1%**
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	-19.0%	-16.8%	**-34.5%**	**-53.0%**	**-54.8%**	**-47.4%**	-23.1%	-21.1%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	18.4%	54.9%	32.1%	-5.0%	31.2%	9.0%	15.3%	19.3%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	37.8%	52.7%	16.3%	21.3%	-1.5%	10.3%	35.5%	20.6%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	*n.a.*	***	**-46.3%**	-12.7%	1.1%	4.1%	-10.0%	-14.2%
22	691	**West LA, CA**	***	***	-22.8%	-20.0%	***	-9.1%	11.1%	1.1%
22	691A4	**Sepulveda, CA**	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***
23	438	**Sioux Falls, SD**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-59.8%**	11.8%	***	***
23	568	**Fort Meade, SD**	-1.6%	**-41.1%**	53.0%	50.6%	54.0%	29.0%	26.5%	13.6%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	35.8%	60.2%	0.6%	26.2%	20.7%	12.2%	44.4%	38.1%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	44.4%	14.1%	26.6%	10.9%	-7.2%
23	636A6	**Des Moines, IA**	*n.a.*	***	7.6%	16.5%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
23	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	5.2%	**-19.8%**	6.6%	36.7%	55.9%	38.5%	52.0%	***
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	6.9%	23.8%	-0.5%	-13.4%	-20.5%	-19.9%	-2.7%	**-26.4%**

† Improvement in mental health problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37e. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %	FY02 Medical Problems Improved %	FY03 Medical Problems Improved %	FY04 Medical Problems Improved %
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	n.a.	***	***	program closed	***	***	59.7%	13.4%
1	518	Bedford, MA	-8.8%	-1.7%	-7.9%	-11.5%	-17.6%	-22.2%	-19.1%	-16.7%
1	523	Boston, MA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-20.7%	-0.8%	14.7%	-16.9%	18.6%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	26.2%	24.2%	-5.8%	12.0%	3.8%	16.0%	11.4%	-4.3%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-33.8%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
1	631	Northampton, MA	1.6%	18.9%	0.0%	-11.5%	0.0%	14.1%	16.6%	40.5%
1	650	Providence, RI	2.2%	13.2%	0.0%	20.3%	50.1%	-21.4%	-12.0%	-32.5%
1	689	West Haven, CT	-18.6%	-3.9%	20.3%	0.9%	14.9%	-35.2%	-26.3%	-8.7%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-19.3%	-12.2%	-27.1%	-35.7%	-16.2%	-30.3%	-27.9%	-35.6%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	17.7%	13.4%	15.3%	***	40.1%	-4.8%	16.0%	-3.4%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	26.4%	-104.6%	76.2%	63.2%	58.0%	71.9%	39.6%	63.4%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-27.8%	19.6%	-9.0%	0.2%	-53.2%	-34.6%	-3.4%	-11.1%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	-26.9%	1.6%	-11.1%	-12.1%	-14.3%	-9.7%	-19.7%	-25.6%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-7.9%	96.7%	***	-54.8%	-40.1%	-33.1%	-56.3%	-38.4%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	see below	see below	10.9%	-1.1%	see below	see below	see below	see below
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	1.9%	75.3%	see above	see above	-10.0%	9.2%	12.9%	29.4%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	-9.5%	80.6%	see above	see above	59.3%	70.0%	66.7%	66.9%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-12.1%	4.3%	-12.0%	1.6%	-16.6%	-20.5%	-34.0%	-19.1%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	n.a.	-4.2%	-1.9%	15.9%	-18.2%	-10.4%	2.8%	-18.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	-23.2%	26.7%	5.8%	***	5.2%	15.0%	9.5%	-4.1%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	29.3%	***	21.5%	-1.5%	-6.5%	8.4%	-2.7%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	-5.2%	42.5%	50.5%	9.7%	26.8%	25.9%	34.5%	43.1%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	-30.3%	3.3%	-13.5%	-24.6%	-18.6%	9.3%	-6.1%	-27.5%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	87.6%	79.5%	65.9%	80.0%	80.9%	program closed	
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-28.4%	-8.8%	-27.3%	-22.9%	31.7%	19.8%	-5.2%	-24.5%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-7.2%	27.3%	10.5%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-2.5%	18.0%	***	-46.7%	-21.3%	-8.4%	-31.9%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	n.a.	***	***	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	18.6%	-10.4%	-14.9%	***	-18.5%	-0.5%	-25.6%	-17.3%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	n.a.	***	-5.7%	27.7%	17.1%	48.0%	36.9%	18.7%
5	688	Washington DC	-23.0%	1.0%	-21.4%	-32.1%	17.8%	16.7%	19.0%	-4.1%
6	558	Durham, NC	-5.3%	15.2%	16.5%	***	65.2%	***	program closed	program closed
6	590	Hampton, VA	-3.7%	-4.2%	-6.9%	-21.2%	-21.7%	-22.1%	-15.4%	-31.4%
6	637	Asheville, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-33.2%	43.2%	60.2%	-19.9%
6	652	Richmond, VA	-26.1%	-18.7%	-11.9%	program closed	***	-67.0%	-37.6%	55.9%
6	658	Salem, VA	-24.9%	-16.6%	42.2%	69.5%	75.3%	54.4%	32.8%	45.9%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	4.2%	0.0%	11.8%	10.9%	-7.3%	9.9%	20.1%	-9.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-7.0%	-11.3%	4.1%	-24.9%	9.9%	-35.4%	-27.0%	-25.8%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	n.a.	n.a.	70.2%	60.9%	72.6%	42.4%	65.6%	48.7%
7	534	Charleston, SC	-5.9%	18.3%	2.0%	6.5%	-1.3%	-11.5%	37.5%	64.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	1.6%	11.4%	-7.2%
7	557	Dublin, GA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	73.6%	66.9%	55.5%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-46.4%	8.3%	75.8%	73.5%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	9.6%	28.9%	-9.4%	18.1%	0.2%	-9.6%	-0.5%	-21.0%

Table 37e cont. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %	FY02 Medical Problems Improved %	FY03 Medical Problems Improved %	FY04 Medical Problems Improved %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	**-19.5%**	74.0%	67.4%	**-21.0%**	0.7%	2.6%	18.5%	5.4%
8	546	Miami, FL	-15.8%	6.7%	12.5%	-0.5%	**-28.7%**	**-20.7%**	**-29.4%**	**-23.4%**
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	***	**-46.6%**	**-47.6%**	**-30.8%**	**-35.4%**	-22.8%
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	*see below*	*see below*	-2.1%	12.0%	9.2%	-2.0%	**-26.9%**	-19.3%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	11.7%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	-4.6%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	673	Tampa, FL	-0.6%	26.4%	2.7%	-11.1%	6.7%	-12.1%	-15.0%	**-25.4%**
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								39.6%
9	596	Lexington, KY	-16.1%	-16.7%	**-33.7%**	**-24.5%**	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	30.0%	30.1%	26.5%	-2.3%	31.3%	-9.1%	8.6%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-9.2%	1.4%	**-21.4%**	**-33.3%**	32.2%	66.6%	53.9%	51.6%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	-11.6%	-11.7%	**-19.4%**	**-29.0%**	**-31.1%**	**-21.2%**	**-34.4%**	**-38.4%**
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	4.9%	3.2%	-16.3%	-15.2%	-7.9%	33.9%	3.2%	20.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	70.3%	55.7%	37.9%	44.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	6.7%	3.3%	-18.8%	***	21.3%	14.5%	-1.6%	19.8%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***
10	552	Dayton, OH	3.9%	***	-5.1%	***	**-29.5%**	15.7%	15.5%	***
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	-22.9%	-27.3%	**-28.7%**
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	5.2%	13.5%	-0.7%	-12.2%	-3.7%	-13.2%	**-22.8%**	-5.8%
11	550	Danville, IL	-11.0%	***	20.8%	-1.2%	**-29.5%**	14.5%	33.6%	**-36.2%**
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	13.3%	-22.9%	-19.2%	**-50.5%**	**-22.3%**	**-21.8%**	-23.1%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	15.0%	***	30.9%	18.2%	7.0%	3.4%	**-15.5%**	24.7%
12	578	Hines, IL	6.0%	**-25.6%**	**-18.8%**	**-23.2%**	-15.3%	**-39.0%**	**-30.9%**	**-37.5%**
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	Madison, WI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-24.0%	-18.3%
12	676	Tomah, WI	0.0%	30.7%	38.4%	-19.9%	46.8%	42.1%	35.0%	0.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-19.3%	30.1%	26.8%	21.2%	23.2%	7.4%	-3.9%	34.3%
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-8.3%	59.2%	33.1%	42.6%	***	***	18.1%	15.7%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	-2.0%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	68.3%	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	3.1%	**-39.0%**	-21.0%	**-42.3%**
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	2.1%	17.2%	30.4%	24.0%	12.9%	29.1%	47.0%	38.3%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-16.6%	4.5%	27.1%	11.3%	20.8%	8.3%	0.5%	**-23.5%**
16	580	Houston, TX	**-22.3%**	50.4%	33.7%	36.6%	46.5%	-8.7%	**-16.6%**	**-33.5%**
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	27.7%	-18.8%	-5.9%	**-31.8%**	-10.1%	**-30.5%**	-16.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-15.2%	6.3%	-13.5%	**-12.9%**	-12.1%	-11.8%	**-23.8%**	-18.9%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	47.9%	**-28.0%**	***	**-64.6%**	**-39.0%**	**-25.0%**	-12.8%	**-25.3%**
17	549	Dallas, TX	-0.1%	10.6%	-5.6%	-4.5%	4.3%	0.0%	**-15.4%**	**-22.7%**
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	45.8%	41.9%	57.8%	46.4%	41.5%	62.7%	38.2%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	21.9%	24.3%	27.5%	32.7%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	-13.9%	33.7%	29.0%	-8.4%	**-91.5%**	-11.3%	**-26.1%**	-6.2%
17	674	Temple, TX	15.6%	2.5%	***	***	-2.8%	7.3%	25.4%	24.5%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	12.5%	3.8%	***	***	7.6%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37e cont. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %	FY02 Medical Problems Improved %	FY03 Medical Problems Improved %	FY04 Medical Problems Improved %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-22.3%	20.8%	3.8%	-2.8%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	***	***	-2.9%	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
18	649	Prescott, AZ	29.7%	60.6%	51.5%	62.6%	47.0%	28.3%	43.8%	33.9%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	**-25.7%**	-11.0%	-17.1%	17.5%	-11.6%	15.8%	-19.0%	-20.8%
18	756	El Paso	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-0.5%	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	18.8%	-4.4%	**-35.4%**	-6.6%	-13.4%	-5.4%	-14.4%	-4.4%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-2.6%	-21.2%	***	***	***	-13.7%	***
20	463	Anchorage, AK	-13.2%	19.0%	9.1%	18.2%	34.5%	31.9%	29.8%	32.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	-26.6%	21.9%	54.4%	68.8%	60.1%	60.8%	65.5%	69.3%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-18.1%	-36.6%	-2.7%	10.1%	-16.9%	***	-42.5%	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-9.1%	-12.2%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	-2.7%	1.6%	27.4%	25.1%	14.7%	-12.2%	-2.8%	-18.0%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	19.5%	-35.1%	-25.6%
20	692	White City, OR	-5.0%	16.3%	17.4%	32.5%	29.7%	61.1%	49.2%	24.1%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	***	-32.2%	13.9%	**-51.0%**	2.3%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	4.5%	-17.3%	-14.2%	10.4%	0.8%	-3.0%	4.9%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	6.2%	***	**-34.5%**	36.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	-10.3%	**-20.8%**	-16.0%	**-23.1%**	**-42.4%**	**-27.3%**	-5.8%	**-22.3%**
22	600	Long Beach, CA	-4.7%	34.6%	36.8%	20.6%	45.6%	36.1%	33.0%	48.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	12.1%	39.5%	15.0%	27.7%	27.0%	45.1%	24.1%	27.8%
22	664	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	-22.7%	2.1%	15.6%	20.2%	-2.7%	13.5%
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	6.9%	11.6%	***	29.1%	29.6%	-28.6%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
23	437	Fargo, ND	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-21.0%	-15.2%	***	***
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	12.3%	-1.1%	43.7%	71.3%	81.2%	48.5%	57.7%	57.4%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	26.6%	37.9%	***	69.2%	32.4%	57.3%	59.8%	57.6%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-11.2%	-20.0%	27.8%	-3.3%	**-24.9%**
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	2.3%	39.9%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	11.9%	-12.8%	16.1%	45.5%	77.0%	62.1%	57.9%	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	9.2%	31.3%	1.2%	0.0%	-4.9%	-4.5%	0.0%	**-23.4%**

† Improvement in medical problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37f. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY02 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY03 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY04 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***	***	23.2%	2.1%
1	518	Bedford, MA	**-31.9%**	**-25.8%**	**-14.0%**	**-9.6%**	**-12.5%**	**-15.3%**	**-17.0%**	**-14.5%**
1	523	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-7.3%	22.2%	9.1%	5.4%	1.6%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	1.3%	-8.8%	-9.7%	-11.7%	**-24.5%**	**-14.0%**	2.1%	-14.3%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-8.3%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	631	Northampton, MA	-0.2%	**-15.2%**	-4.3%	6.4%	15.1%	6.0%	4.2%	1.5%
1	650	Providence, RI	**-18.4%**	**-22.0%**	**-18.6%**	-14.3%	**-24.0%**	**-20.6%**	-2.7%	-11.7%
1	689	West Haven, CT	0.0%	-7.7%	25.8%	1.7%	6.7%	3.0%	6.3%	1.7%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-9.8%	-12.1%	-10.5%	-11.1%	-2.1%	-6.3%	4.7%	1.2%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	-4.8%	**-21.4%**	**-18.2%**	2.5%	9.0%	16.2%	19.6%	-5.9%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	4.8%	**-43.5%**	-1.4%	11.8%	20.2%	24.0%	-1.4%	-41.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	**-16.4%**	-10.5%	-1.5%	8.0%	-4.4%	**-14.0%**	6.3%	5.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	**-16.7%**	-8.9%	-2.2%	2.6%	13.4%	4.0%	10.1%	4.3%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-23.8%	10.0%	-7.6%	-3.7%	0.6%	-1.1%	-0.3%	6.5%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	14.9%	11.8%	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-4.1%	20.1%	*see above*	*see above*	15.2%	19.4%	-10.3%	-12.8%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	9.8%	**20.1%**	*see above*	*see above*	12.6%	-2.6%	-0.4%	16.4%
3	620	Montrose, NY	5.6%	**-13.1%**	**-12.4%**	-5.1%	**-10.9%**	-6.3%	-10.5%	0.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	4.7%	23.3%	2.9%	-5.6%	-2.4%	-11.5%	-9.8%
3	632	Northport, NY	-12.8%	-3.9%	9.6%	***	**-17.1%**	-2.6%	1.8%	-15.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	-3.6%	-10.9%	-1.8%	-4.7%	-1.4%	0.7%	**-27.8%**
4	542	Coatesville, PA	-5.4%	21.6%	2.2%	**-9.3%**	10.4%	2.6%	-0.2%	0.3%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	1.6%	-2.3%	0.5%	4.7%	9.3%	2.6%	-8.6%	-2.5%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	-6.6%	31.2%	**-19.2%**	-1.6%	49.5%	*program closed*	*program closed*
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-0.9%	-10.0%	1.7%	**-12.8%**	-4.7%	-0.4%	-3.9%	1.5%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	24.2%	6.6%	21.4%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-6.0%	-9.0%	10.3%	**-34.9%**	0.6%	-4.1%	-11.0%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	21.9%	14.3%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	23.9%	-6.3%	-12.0%	***	**-16.9%**	**-19.3%**	**-25.8%**	**-8.9%**
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	21.2%	6.4%	-6.0%	0.0%	**-14.8%**	**-11.5%**
5	688	Washington DC	20.3%	-15.2%	8.6%	1.3%	7.4%	6.6%	7.0%	0.2%
6	558	Durham, NC	29.9%	9.3%	5.2%	-4.0%	-7.7%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
6	590	Hampton, VA	20.0%	-10.3%	3.3%	7.1%	15.0%	1.2%	20.0%	15.2%
6	637	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	11.6%	24.1%	20.3%	-3.9%
6	652	Richmond, VA	**-24.9%**	3.4%	-18.5%	*program closed*	***	-24.9%	-15.2%	3.9%
6	658	Salem, VA	**-20.9%**	-6.0%	-2.8%	-11.5%	-11.2%	**-17.8%**	-7.9%	2.9%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-1.7%	-9.7%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	6.8%	10.5%	1.4%
7	509	Augusta, GA	**-23.9%**	**-24.2%**	3.0%	-7.8%	-11.5%	-15.7%	-14.4%	-4.2%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	21.4%	16.0%	21.1%	**-16.1%**	17.1%	16.1%
7	534	Charleston, SC	-5.6%	11.1%	2.4%	17.1%	-11.3%	9.5%	22.8%	6.2%
7	544	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	4.9%	-3.1%	**-13.1%**
7	557	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	9.6%	***	2.2%	**-18.3%**	**-8.1%**
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-35.3%**	-6.6%	12.5%	13.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	0.0%	-10.5%	-5.7%	-10.8%	-1.9%	4.3%	6.8%	10.9%

Table 37f cont. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY02 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY03 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY04 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	-1.0%	-7.9%	-4.8%	**-9.6%**	-7.6%	-7.5%	1.2%	10.3%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	14.9%	-18.7%	-11.8%	11.0%	17.9%	8.4%	3.1%	14.7%
8	548	**W. Palm Beach, FL**	*n.a.*	***	-3.9%	15.1%	17.9%	11.5%	13.2%	18.3%
8	573	**N.FL/S.GA VHS**	*see below*	*see below*	10.3%	10.2%	10.7%	9.8%	13.8%	21.3%
8	573A	**Gainesville, FL**	***	13.8%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	**Lake City, FL**	***	9.4%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	-4.8%	10.0%	4.8%	11.5%	28.4%	30.1%	14.2%	15.7%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**								29.2%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	**-13.3%**	**-22.8%**	-6.5%	**-18.4%**	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	***	-12.8%	0.2%	-11.6%	2.4%	15.8%	**-28.6%**	**-19.4%**
9	621	**Mt. Home, TN**	-5.0%	**-25.1%**	**-11.0%**	**-11.3%**	-8.0%	-4.0%	**-12.3%**	**-3.6%**
9	622	**Murfreesboro, TN**	-6.6%	-11.5%	-5.2%	**-12.5%**	-9.3%	-9.6%	**-18.4%**	**-7.0%**
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	-5.9%	9.4%	-2.2%	7.7%	7.9%	23.5%	13.2%	8.9%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	40.8%	29.0%	0.0%	-8.7%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	-0.4%	-2.3%	10.3%	-2.6%	-3.4%	**-13.6%**	**-25.2%**	**-17.3%**
10	756	**Columbus, OH**								
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	6.9%	***	10.3%	-6.9%	-9.0%	-16.5%	-9.1%	***
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	-11.2%	-15.0%	-5.8%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	-7.3%	-4.6%	-0.2%	-4.8%	-4.9%	**-16.1%**	-7.2%	-13.7%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	**-26.9%**	***	8.3%	-18.4%	-9.0%	**-25.2%**	12.2%	-4.5%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	*n.a.*	14.6%	-17.0%	-5.4%	-3.6%	6.2%	-0.7%	2.2%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	**-16.4%**	***	13.6%	22.4%	14.6%	21.7%	5.8%	13.8%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	2.8%	**-28.3%**	4.0%	5.0%	0.2%	**-11.1%**	-8.8%	8.1%
12	585	**Iron Mountain, MI**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	**Madison, WI**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	3.9%	-2.5%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	-10.0%	**-23.8%**	1.6%	**-23.1%**	-7.6%	-6.0%	9.2%	-1.8%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	12.0%	**-17.7%**	-6.3%	-3.4%	-5.0%	**-14.5%**	**-20.9%**	**-17.4%**
15	589	**Kansas City, KS**	**-19.1%**	-9.8%	-7.2%	-7.3%	***	***	-7.0%	2.2%
15	589A4	**Columbia, MO**	***	***	-7.9%	***	***	***	***	6.6%
15	647	**Poplar Bluff, MO**	***	0.0%	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	**St. Louis, MO**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
15	677	**Topeka, KS**	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	-16.9%	-16.0%	4.6	-14.0%
15	677A4	**Leavenworth, KS**	**-22.2%**	-6.3%	-6.8%	-12.9%	5.0%	7.5%	0.5%	-0.3%
16	520	**Biloxi, MI**	**-20.2%**	-9.2%	7.6%	-4.7%	4.5%	1.7%	-3.1%	-11.0%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	5.6%	16.2%	3.5%	11.1%	8.0%	-4.1%	-8.3%	-5.5%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	***	-20.4%	-11.3%	-8.4%	-4.8%	**-37.2%**	10.9%	-9.3%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	-19.5%	-5.0%	2.1%	0.0%	6.0%	0.2%	2.2%	8.3%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	-18.1%	**-27.2%**	***	**-30.8%**	-13.3%	-12.1%	-0.1%	-13.1%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	**-21.1%**	**-21.7%**	**-25.5%**	**-17.1%**	**-19.4%**	**-27.6%**	**-25.1%**	**-27.8%**
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	*n.a.*	-1.1%	2.1%	-9.0%	7.1%	0.9%	-15.0%	-9.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-10.7%	-9.8%	**-12.5%**	**-14.6%**
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	-1.9%	-17.0%	14.3%	-3.8%	-14.7%	-8.9%	-6.6%	6.2%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	-9.1%	**-30.2%**	**-24.8%**	**-20.0%**	27.4%	5.6%	-9.0%	-0.2%
17	674A4	**Waco, TX**	4.3%	**-18.8%**	***	***	-13.7%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37f cont. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY02 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY03 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY04 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-4.7%	-12.6%	-9.2%	-2.3%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	***	5.2%	21.7%	14.7%	program closed	program closed	program closed
18	649	Prescott, AZ	-8.6%	-12.9%	5.9%	-2.0%	-1.1%	-4.6%	8.1%	-1.4%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	-8.5%	**-29.7%**	-0.6%	9.6%	-7.5%	-5.4%	**-19.1%**	**-15.4%**
18	756	El Paso	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	4.8%	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	14.1%	18.4%	13.9%	30.2%	7.7%	-2.5%	14.8%	25.4%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	n.a.	-12.0%	-26.8%	5.8%	***	***	-17.2%	***
20	463	Anchorage, AK	-13.8%	-10.2%	-13.5%	20.2%	-4.3%	-7.7%	0.3%	-7.4%
20	648	Portland, OR	-10.5%	**-25.7%**	-0.5%	2.7%	-6.6%	-11.3%	-7.3%	4.1%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-3.2%	**-34.5%**	-5.4%	-10.7%	**-29.4%**	***	-11.3%	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	17.8%	**-36.0%**	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	0.9%	-9.3%	8.3%	11.7%	-7.3%	7.3%	-19.8%	-4.3%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	14.7%	-2.8%	3.1%
20	692	White City, OR	11.1%	0.7%	5.5%	1.5%	5.2%	9.6%	14.3%	6.7%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	18.6%	1.9%	17.6%	1.2%	-13.7%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	**-17.7%**	3.6%	2.7%	15.0%	-1.0%	-3.1%	12.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	-15.0%	-9.6%	***	**-33.0%**	**-32.4%**
21	662	San Francisco, CA	6.1%	-1.7%	-1.6%	-3.7%	**-19.4%**	**-16.6%**	-9.5%	2.6%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	-7.9%	5.2%	22.5%	0.6%	28.8%	-0.8%	7.4%	20.8%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	24.1%	8.5%	-4.7%	**-13.2%**	6.9%	12.4%	5.5%	10.7%
22	664	San Diego, CA	n.a.	***	-6.3%	16.4%	16.0%	2.4%	-11.2%	**-20.2%**
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	**-25.5%**	16.4%	***	6.2%	-0.2%	20.1%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437	Fargo, ND	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-9.4%	-6.3%	***	***
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	-12.7%	**-30.7%**	4.7%	12.4%	6.9%	-9.7%	-1.4%	-7.6%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	-4.4%	-12.1%	-11.0%	-7.6%	1.7%	-7.2%	4.5%	12.8%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	21.6%	20.2%	6.8%	17.5%	-10.0%
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	n.a.	***	5.7%	13.5%	***	***	program closed	program closed
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	**-18.7%**	0.9%	5.3%	6.6%	21.5%	5.6%	3.3%	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	-1.8%	-5.2%	6.5%	-5.6%	-9.4%	-8.3%	-8.1%	**-10.5%**

† Improvement in competitive employment situation has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37g. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY02 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY03 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY04 Unemployed at Discharge %
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***	***	-21.7%	-14.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	-8.9%	0.6%	6.9%	**16.3%**	9.3%	**15.8%**	**23.0%**	**23.2%**
1	523	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**23.8%**	-5.3%	-0.9%	8.2%	**17.3%**
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	7.6%	-10.4%	-2.8%	2.9%	4.5%	**13.3%**	-0.2%	**21.7%**
1	608	Manchester, NH	11.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	631	Northampton, MA	2.8%	9.2%	-1.8%	-2.0%	-5.7%	0.0%	3.5%	2.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	-5.7%	-6.9%	-10.7%	-7.0%	1.1%	**16.2%**	-6.2%	**14.8%**
1	689	West Haven, CT	-13.5%	0.5%	-4.6%	-7.1%	-9.7%	3.3%	9.7%	8.6%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	**31.7%**	**18.9%**	**25.2%**	**16.7%**	8.5%	**15.1%**	-2.9%	0.1%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	-18.1%	7.3%	0.0%	-16.3%	-17.4%	-19.3%	-10.7%	-12.3%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	**17.4%**	15.2%	-8.5%	-3.4%	-17.6%	-22.3%	3.5%	**16.2%**
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	6.8%	10.9%	11.4%	-4.8%	**16.7%**	**16.8%**	0.8%	-3.5%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	13.1%	-3.5%	-15.3%	-10.0%	-15.6%	-15.3%	0.0%	10.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	**43.6%**	0.0%	**17.6%**	**23.5%**	9.8%	8.5%	**12.0%**	6.8%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	-3.5%	-1.4%	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	**26.7%**	-6.8%	*see above*	*see above*	-25.5%	-13.6%	-3.0%	-16.7%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	0.9%	-10.3%	*see above*	*see above*	-17.0%	-20.6%	-21.0%	-21.4%
3	620	Montrose, NY	7.1%	0.8%	8.0%	0.0%	-2.2%	-2.1%	1.2%	-3.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	8.8%	5.3%	**21.5%**	9.2%	-3.9%	4.5%	**16.2%**
3	632	Northport, NY	**26.2%**	1.9%	9.1%	***	7.8%	2.9%	-9.2%	7.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	**22.9%**	**36.6%**	**15.4%**	13.4%	-2.2%	13.7%	**34.3%**
4	542	Coatesville, PA	-3.3%	0.4%	8.0%	-13.9%	-20.0%	-19.2%	-5.9%	-12.4%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	**17.4%**	**24.5%**	**27.2%**	**21.5%**	14.0%	**19.8%**	**25.4%**	8.8%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	**30.3%**	2.6%	**56.0%**	**34.0%**	-15.6%	*program closed*	*program closed*
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	0.0%	-2.2%	-6.3%	0.9%	-10.6%	-15.8%	-1.1%	3.5%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-13.1%	-7.3%	-14.7%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	**21.1%**	**23.8%**	16.6%	14.4%	-19.2%	-25.0%	-14.6%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	-15.0%	15.9%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	-4.9%	15.7%	11.0%	***	8.5%	**21.0%**	**31.3%**	**14.3%**
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	-14.7%	-0.6%	-12.4%	-14.9%	-0.6%	-0.2%
5	688	Washington DC	0.5%	**39.4%**	12.4%	**21.6%**	**16.1%**	**15.2%**	10.1%	11.7%
6	558	Durham, NC	-13.9%	-16.2%	-13.0%	-18.4%	-15.9%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
6	590	Hampton, VA	-9.4%	**16.9%**	-3.2%	**12.8%**	-6.7%	7.8%	0.5%	0.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-13.2%	-14.0%	-14.7%	-0.5%
6	652	Richmond, VA	**41.6%**	4.2%	**32.4%**	*program closed*	***	**46.4%**	**45.4%**	**20.3%**
6	658	Salem, VA	14.8%	-0.8%	**20.6%**	**38.4%**	**17.7%**	**21.2%**	**22.1%**	8.9%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-17.6%	-15.9%	-8.5%	-18.5%	-10.0%	-4.0%	-8.9%	-7.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-18.9%	-3.4%	-2.3%	-6.3%	-1.5%	11.1%	3.9%	1.3%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-12.1%	-13.7%	-22.9%	-18.1%	-9.4%	-15.5%
7	534	Charleston, SC	-4.3%	-14.5%	-11.4%	-19.7%	-18.1%	-15.7%	-19.6%	-9.7%
7	544	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	8.3%	**28.4%**	**30.0%**
7	557	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-12.1%	***	18.2%	**21.4%**	2.6%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**26.6%**	8.9%	-3.1%	-8.5%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	0.4%	9.1%	6.0%	**16.0%**	4.6%	-2.1%	-19.3%	-21.7%

Table 37g cont. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY02 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY03 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY04 Unemployed at Discharge %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	2.3%	-6.4%	-6.6%	11.0%	-9.1%	-21.8%	-7.6%	-6.3%
8	546	Miami, FL	-7.1%	-13.3%	-9.6%	-8.2%	-12.8%	-17.5%	-5.9%	-10.1%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-7.3%	4.4%	-26.4%	-1.3%	-20.1%	-17.9%
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	*see below*	*see below*	-8.8%	-14.3%	-23.8%	-14.4%	-23.8%	-23.1%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	-2.9%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	-2.6%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	673	Tampa, FL	10.5%	-18.2%	-19.6%	-9.5%	-20.0%	-15.6%	5.8%	2.4%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								-10.5%
9	596	Lexington, KY	-6.3%	7.0%	3.9%	11.6%	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	25.0%	-1.6%	4.6%	-7.7%	-18.7%	4.9%	22.8%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-1.8%	15.3%	6.0%	8.7%	4.2%	8.2%	3.1%	-4.6%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	1.9%	22.9%	20.4%	20.4%	13.4%	8.1%	13.9%	13.5%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	-1.4%	-12.7%	2.4%	2.9%	6.6%	-19.0%	-15.3%	-13.1%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-21.4%	-20.5%	-3.4%	-2.4%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	22.7%	7.5%	0.7%	25.6%	17.4%	18.1%	2.1%	10.2%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***
10	552	Dayton, OH	-14.1%	***	0.2%	-1.1%	-5.6%	-7.0%	-7.2%	***
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	23.1%	22.9%	25.2%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	11.5%	11.7%	12.2%	11.6%	11.9%	-1.6%	-11.8%	1.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	16.8%	***	-18.4%	19.1%	-5.6%	20.2%	-11.3%	-0.7%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	-4.1%	1.0%	9.4%	7.6%	9.6%	-9.2%	-7.1%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	-5.2%	***	9.2%	5.0%	5.3%	-0.2%	12.7%	7.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	-17.6%	7.8%	-0.9%	5.8%	-4.3%	-2.6%	-0.6%	-20.5%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	Madison, WI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	18.1%	10.7%
12	676	Tomah, WI	16.7%	7.5%	-2.3%	28.1%	12.3%	7.5%	10.3%	5.7%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	7.9%	4.7%	3.4%	2.0%	8.3%	14.5%	19.3%	21.6%
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-0.5%	20.3%	32.1%	23.5%	***	***	5.5%	-8.7%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	18.2%	***	***	***	***	3.4%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-2.4%	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	19.0%	13.1%	26.3%	17.5%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	19.9%	0.1%	-9.0%	0.1%	-2.6%	-19.8%	1.9%	-13.4%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	35.5%	15.8%	10.4%	28.1%	15.3%	14.2%	16.2%	24.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	-12.7%	-12.1%	-6.6%	-4.9%	-15.4%	2.1%	3.6%	-3.5%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	30.6%	28.6%	-4.0%	18.3%	43.1%	-2.7%	20.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-3.1%	8.5%	9.9%	12.6%	10.7%	4.3%	9.7%	6.2%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	24.8%	-10.0%	***	4.5%	-1.3%	-3.1%	2.0%	11.7%
17	549	Dallas, TX	6.2%	3.6%	6.9%	20.1%	12.5%	26.6%	6.3%	8.5%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	-1.2%	-1.8%	3.4%	0.5%	-0.4%	2.6%	-9.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	17.8%	23.0%	-6.5%	-9.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	12.8%	11.4%	1.4%	13.3%	-19.3%	-16.6%	-10.4%	-20.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	-2.0%	28.2%	37.3%	2.3%	-24.8%	1.1%	12.8%	11.2%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	6.3%	-2.9%	***	***	10.6%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37g cont. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

			FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY02 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY03 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY04 Unemployed at Discharge %
VISN		SITE								
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	20.6%	-5.3%	-13.6%	-14.3%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	***	-6.6%	-8.7%	-7.7%	program closed	program closed	program closed
18	649	Prescott, AZ	22.8%	37.8%	24.4%	22.0%	28.9%	23.5%	25.3%	19.5%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	-4.9%	3.8%	-3.2%	-3.9%	0.0%	3.2%	2.3%	-3.1%
18	756	El Paso	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-15.3%	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	-18.9%	-9.0%	-18.7%	-20.1%	-14.6%	-1.5%	-9.6%	-15.4%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	n.a.	-3.3%	21.1%	-20.7%	***	***	-25.8%	***
20	463	Anchorage, AK	26.3%	21.0%	-3.5%	-4.7%	-7.8%	-21.3%	-8.6%	-5.8%
20	648	Portland, OR	18.8%	26.3%	11.7%	-4.9%	8.3%	9.5%	7.3%	4.7%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	11.0%	28.0%	19.0%	20.5%	52.9%	***	-4.5%	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-6.6%	21.0%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	13.1%	14.2%	-0.9%	-0.5%	0.5%	-6.6%	23.5%	-7.1%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-7.3%	-0.3%	-5.2%
20	692	White City, OR	-6.7%	3.0%	-3.7%	11.6%	-14.0%	-1.1%	-13.5%	-13.3%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	-12.9%	6.4%	-11.4%	-13.2%	10.7%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	30.4%	2.9%	-3.1%	1.7%	11.2%	0.9%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	-11.2%	-6.2%	***	10.7%	-23.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	4.0%	6.7%	14.2%	1.6%	2.1%	7.8%	5.1%	11.5%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	15.8%	-2.0%	-3.5%	4.7%	-7.9%	-14.2%	-11.5%	-3.4%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	-22.6%	-10.2%	-6.3%	-8.6%	-19.9%	-22.7%	-21.8%	-23.4%
22	664	San Diego, CA	n.a.	***	-23.8%	-4.7%	-20.0%	-14.4%	-2.7%	5.1%
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	1.1%	-5.8%	***	-9.6%	1.3%	-6.8%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437	Fargo, ND	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	19.5%	26.0%	***	***
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	4.4%	0.4%	-16.6%	-7.8%	-12.9%	4.3%	-2.5%	-18.6%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	17.4%	10.2%	18.8%	12.5%	9.4%	9.7%	-0.9%	-11.2%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-5.7%	-26.0%	-10.5%	-8.5%	-3.5%
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	n.a.	***	-2.6%	-11.8%	***	***	program closed	program closed
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	4.8%	-12.0%	-2.4%	-4.9%	-20.8%	-17.5%	-3.9%	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	-0.5%	10.4%	0.9%	8.1%	15.4%	31.1%	25.3%	22.0%

† Improvement in unemployment has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37h. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY02 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY03 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***	***	-1.6%
1	518	Bedford, MA	**53.6%**	**42.8%**	**22.6%**	**14.4%**	**17.6%**	**12.6%**	**6.8%**
1	523	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-14.3%	-9.7%	-11.0%	-4.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	-2.7%	6.9%	5.8%	4.8%	10.0%	-5.4%	-6.5%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-6.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	631	Northampton, MA	4.5%	**15.1%**	**13.3%**	5.1%	1.7%	0.4%	4.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	**13.8%**	**17.4%**	6.1%	-2.8%	-3.7%	8.4%	4.6%
1	689	West Haven, CT	**17.6%**	10.6%	-7.3%	6.1%	0.0%	-3.2%	-5.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-11.1%	-5.4%	-7.5%	-8.9%	2.8%	-8.5%	4.6%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	**28.2%**	**20.9%**	8.0%	8.6%	0.9%	10.1%	-5.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	-14.7%	**49.5%**	-7.9%	-2.6%	-3.4%	-1.0%	1.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-8.2%	-0.6%	4.8%	-4.8%	-8.8%	-10.7%	-4.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	4.6%	**12.4%**	**19.4%**	7.6%	-2.0%	**8.3%**	2.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-5.8%	-9.7%	-10.9%	-13.2%	-12.0%	-10.2%	-7.1%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	0.1%	1.9%	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-15.1%	-2.3%	*see above*	*see above*	-2.3%	-10.8%	5.9%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	-0.6%	0.0%	*see above*	*see above*	2.0%	-8.4%	-8.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	1.9%	**11.8%**	9.9%	**8.9%**	**12.4%**	3.5%	**10.5%**
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	-4.7%	-13.0%	-12.7%	4.3%	1.0%	6.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	-4.5%	**19.4%**	-10.6%	-15.2%	**25.5%**	**14.6%**	2.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	-5.1%	-13.2%	-13.9%	-11.6%	-10.8%	-8.8%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	0.9%	-8.1%	-11.4%	**8.6%**	**18.8%**	**20.4%**	**15.9%**
4	595	Lebanon, PA	-11.1%	-4.7%	-11.3%	-11.7%	-9.6%	-9.9%	-4.7%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	-10.2%	-13.9%	-14.0%	-12.5%	-10.5%	*program closed*
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-1.8%	**10.8%**	0.9%	6.9%	2.2%	3.4%	**9.4%**
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-2.3%	5.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-10.0%	-6.7%	-13.0%	4.2%	-7.1%	-1.2%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	-12.9%	-14.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	-8.2%	13.7%	-10.8%	17.2%	-7.0%	0.0%	-4.6%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	-5.6%	-10.5%	0.5%	-2.8%	0.0%
5	688	Washington DC	-8.3%	-9.4%	-13.1%	-13.4%	-12.2%	-9.8%	-8.9%
6	558	Durham, NC	-2.3%	3.2%	-3.1%	13.2%	7.4%	***	*program closed*
6	590	Hampton, VA	0.0%	-2.9%	-3.0%	-3.5%	-3.5%	-2.9%	-6.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	**34.3%**	9.2%	-5.3%	1.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	-11.4%	4.0%	-12.9%	*program closed*	***	-11.6%	-10.3%
6	658	Salem, VA	**18.1%**	5.0%	-12.7%	-12.8%	-10.0%	-1.3%	-8.0%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	**28.5%**	**34.8%**	**22.4%**	**28.5%**	**18.0%**	-1.3%	5.3%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-5.9%	**19.4%**	5.7%	0.2%	-6.0%	-8.1%	-0.2%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-8.8%	6.2%	8.7%	**27.5%**	2.5%
7	534	Charleston, SC	**20.6%**	**17.5%**	12.9%	-1.6%	4.3%	**9.1%**	7.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	1.5%	-8.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	1.1%	***	-11.0%	-2.9%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**21.7%**	10.4%	1.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	2.7%	**13.6%**	8.2%	2.1%	-3.6%	7.2%	-1.8%

Table 37h cont. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY02 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY032 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	1.5%	18.7%	19.0%	-0.4%	16.9%	30.2%	5.2%
8	546	Miami, FL	-6.9%	24.1%	11.8%	2.7%	1.1%	10.4%	3.6%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	24.2%	-4.6%	-0.7%	0.0%	15.9%
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	see below	see below	5.0%	9.3%	7.4%	9.4%	14.5%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	5.1%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	-1.6%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	673	Tampa, FL	1.3%	11.4%	15.8%	3.1%	3.8%	-3.6%	-8.3%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL							
9	596	Lexington, KY	14.9%	23.3%	11.9%	-0.6%	program closed	program closed	program closed
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	-1.6%	2.9%	5.6%	6.8%	2.1%	22.3%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	12.5%	19.9%	19.1%	11.1%	10.5%	4.9%	16.5%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	12.8%	-0.4%	-8.8%	-9.6%	-10.6%	0.5%	6.5%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	2.3%	-0.1%	-1.5%	-8.2%	-3.7%	-1.9%	0.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-10.5%	2.6%	6.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	-10.1%	5.7%	-0.8%	-7.6%	-9.4%	-2.4%	7.9%
10	756	Columbus, OH							
10	552	Dayton, OH	15.6%	***	2.0%	-13.3%	1.5%	7.4%	-3.1%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	-5.8%	-7.4%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	1.0%	-2.4%	-6.1%	-11.9%	-10.6%	18.0%	1.9%
11	550	Danville, IL	21.8%	***	5.2%	17.6%	1.5%	-0.7%	-6.7%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	n.a.	-0.4%	2.4%	-0.8%	-9.0%	-8.7%	10.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	41.8%	***	-8.2%	-13.1%	-10.9%	-10.9%	-8.5%
12	578	Hines, IL	18.3%	28.0%	10.5%	-2.0%	12.2%	4.3%	4.9%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	-8.6%
12	607	Madison, WI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	6.3%
12	676	Tomah, WI	-2.0%	0.6%	-3.1%	-7.3%	-11.8%	0.9%	4.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-10.1%	4.3%	-5.9%	-2.9%	0.5%	4.1%	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	26.2%	-6.3%	-9.2%	0.0%	***	***	6.1%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	8.0%	***	***	***	***
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	36.8%	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	see below	see below	see below	see below	5.5%	14.2%	-1.5%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	11.7%	9.6%	22.8%	17.2%	9.3%	30.2%	8.1%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-6.9%	2.4%	-2.1%	-5.1%	-8.0%	-6.9%	-0.9%
16	580	Houston, TX	2.6%	-2.2%	2.9%	-2.5%	3.2%	4.9%	8.4%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	-4.5%	-4.3%	11.5%	-4.8%	13.4%	-3.1%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	17.1%	-3.8%	-5.4%	-11.7%	-10.2%	-1.9%	-2.3%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	-0.9%	48.3%	***	33.4%	23.0%	7.8%	8.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	10.1%	15.4%	15.8%	5.2%	10.7%	5.5%	22.5%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	n.a.	-1.1%	-6.8%	-5.5%	-7.0%	-1.9%	-0.1%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-3.6%	-8.1%	15.8%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	-11.8%	4.6%	3.6%	-0.2%	14.5%	11.2%	16.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	13.5%	18.2%	0.0%	24.5%	9.4%	1.8%	4.2%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	-4.4%	16.5%	***	***	5.7%	***	program closed

Table 37h cont. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY02 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY03 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-12.4%	**13.4%**	**18.6%**
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	-7.7%	-1.2%	-2.7%	*program closed*	*program closed*
18	649	Prescott, AZ	-7.5%	-4.0%	-10.2%	-0.6%	-9.4%	-6.8%	-7.5%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	14.1%	**27.3%**	8.3%	9.8%	5.6%	**14.7%**	**13.6%**
18	756	El Paso	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-7.9%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	9.6%	0.6%	-5.7%	8.6%	-5.4%	14.2%	-3.1%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	8.3%	5.3%	**41.1%**	***	***	**53.0%**
20	463	Anchorage, AK	0.0%	2.1%	**34.9%**	-8.7%	**17.2%**	**24.0%**	**14.4%**
20	648	Portland, OR	-3.4%	-8.4%	-6.1%	-4.2%	-4.9%	5.0%	2.5%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-6.0%	0.9%	3.2%	6.3%	-10.4%	***	2.7%
20	663	Seattle, WA	5.6%	-9.3%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	-11.7%	-1.2%	-2.8%	-7.4%	-5.9%	-6.0%	-2.3%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	15.3%	-0.7%
20	692	White City, OR	9.1%	3.3%	3.3%	-6.3%	**16.9%**	0.2%	0.1%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	-13.4%	-13.3%	-4.4%	-8.1%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	-0.8%	3.4%	3.9%	-1.4%	2.9%	**10.7%**
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	**22.4%**	-5.0%	***	-1.8%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	0.6%	-0.6%	1.6%	**15.0%**	**27.3%**	**14.9%**	**10.5%**
22	600	Long Beach, CA	0.5%	4.7%	-10.4%	4.3%	-7.4%	6.2%	2.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	-5.4%	0.7%	2.0%	-1.7%	5.0%	-2.7%	0.7%
22	664	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	-3.0%	0.7%	-7.7%	-4.7%	0.5%
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	**45.3%**	5.0%	***	-5.9%	0.9%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437	Fargo, ND	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.4%	-11.6%	***
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	**18.9%**	**27.7%**	1.6%	-5.6%	-2.0%	-3.1%	-2.6%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	-6.3%	-1.3%	-10.3%	-8.6%	-7.0%	-1.0%	-4.0%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-5.4%	13.4%	**15.2%**	9.0%
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	2.6%	-9.0%	***	***	*program closed*
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	**22.3%**	**10.9%**	-1.1%	5.7%	16.2%	6.8%	1.7%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	**15.5%**	**8.2%**	4.5%	-0.6%	1.2%	-5.5%	-3.9%

† Improvement in employment unknown category has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shade
the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites me
distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Appendix C: Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Data Tables

List of Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Tables

Appendix C.1 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans During FY 2004 by VISN

Appendix C.2 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN

Appendix C.3 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN

Appendix C.4 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN

Appendix C.5 Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by VISN

Appendix C.6 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

Appendix C.7 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

Appendix C.8 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

Appendix C.9 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

Appendix C.10 Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Treatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by Site

Appendix C.1 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN †

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	2,245	25.95	133.17
2	1,970	15.44	83.78
3	2,283	38.52	115.00
4	1,056	37.57	89.64
5	1,471	29.54	94.74
6	965	42.21	93.81
7	2,627	18.30	85.54
8	2,561	15.28	62.44
9	1,133	8.61	64.36
10	4,042	26.42	81.11
11	1,629	25.63	72.61
12	2,051	59.23	122.91
15	1,626	31.66	91.66
16	3,085	28.56	84.31
17	2,080	23.81	91.28
18	1,807	18.36	72.47
19	622	12.93	50.93
20	1,362	18.47	74.17
21	801	20.91	79.13
22	2,074	28.44	105.34
23	2,214	36.16	92.58
All VA	**39,704**	**27.17**	**89.57**
VISN Avg	**1,891**	**26.76**	**87.67**
VISN SD	**789**	**11.36**	**19.31**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 573 group IT, 535 individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance, 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT, 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.2 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN†

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	1,575	23.98	167.57
2	995	20.12	109.38
3	1,737	31.69	142.06
4	658	33.83	105.29
5	751	31.06	110.73
6	342	41.91	111.16
7	1,893	13.12	111.28
8	680	29.58	122.85
9	402	12.99	118.33
10	3,032	23.74	106.57
11	976	19.25	84.75
12	1,240	61.32	135.22
15	666	21.23	125.54
16	965	35.65	108.31
17	1,345	31.20	124.15
18	1,184	22.07	116.32
19	372	13.63	88.03
20	438	28.06	101.32
21	678	20.26	140.76
22	1,417	27.62	135.93
23	1,519	33.61	105.31
All VA	**22,865**	**22,865**	**27.45**
VISN Avg	**1089**	**27.42**	**117.66**
VISN SD	**628**	**10.74**	**18.69**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 - individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation and 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT.

Appendix C.3 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN †

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	414	33.14	196.22
2	801	2.08	133.76
3	436	47.82	124.23
4	316	37.42	87.28
5	451	33.20	129.96
6	407	44.90	139.44
7	426	36.77	142.45
8	226	29.87	126.30
9	519	6.99	84.18
10	1038	27.66	111.04
11	287	60.89	132.60
12	643	50.12	140.85
15	673	52.41	102.07
16	1085	26.98	86.97
17	181	8.45	85.37
18	253	15.36	97.97
19	58	32.91	70.72
20	261	12.75	121.83
21	81	33.56	132.98
22	254	26.56	116.88
23	508	47.53	127.12
All VA	**9,318**	**31.61**	**117.36**
VISN Avg	**444**	**31.78**	**118.58**
VISN SD	**271**	**15.58**	**27.41**

† Includes stop code 573 - group IT and 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT.

Appendix C.4 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN †

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	730	9.28	117.46
2	1,651	5.29	97.51
3	1,012	11.90	88.16
4	622	8.97	70.76
5	1,069	4.82	112.05
6	660	12.31	98.18
7	1,578	4.79	81.57
8	2,172	5.65	90.01
9	380	2.39	88.65
10	1,376	4.44	77.21
11	883	6.22	103.18
12	1,455	9.08	104.40
15	806	2.56	62.65
16	2,514	9.72	96.29
17	1,022	5.91	76.73
18	1,172	2.69	86.46
19	302	3.52	109.27
20	1,032	9.24	94.39
21	190	1.56	61.62
22	1,179	11.12	111.58
23	1,047	4.64	84.29
All VA	**22,852**	**6.85**	**92.57**
VISN Avg	**1088**	**6.48**	**91.07**
VISN SD	**560**	**3.23**	**15.43**

† Includes stop codes 535 - individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational ssistance and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.5 Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by VISN

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
1	2245	61.2%	14.3%	25.8%
2	1970	40.4%	7.2%	54.1%
3	2283	60.5%	10.0%	31.5%
4	1056	38.7%	15.5%	51.7%
5	1471	33.7%	17.3%	51.3%
6	965	18.1%	31.5%	53.9%
7	2627	58.8%	11.9%	32.5%
8	2561	16.4%	6.7%	78.1%
9	1133	25.5%	43.4%	31.5%
10	4042	71.1%	14.3%	15.8%
11	1629	49.5%	7.7%	44.6%
12	2051	42.9%	24.2%	44.8%
15	1626	35.6%	27.6%	37.5%
16	3085	16.3%	18.3%	68.3%
17	2080	55.4%	5.2%	41.0%
18	1807	53.3%	3.7%	44.1%
19	622	53.2%	2.7%	44.7%
20	1362	19.8%	13.4%	67.8%
21	801	78.0%	6.1%	16.4%
22	2074	56.1%	6.0%	42.3%
23	2214	54.6%	11.7%	36.4%
All VA	**39,704**	**45.9%**	**13.6%**	**43.0%**
VISN Avg	**1891**	**44.7%**	**14.2%**	**43.5%**
VISN SD	**789**	**17.7%**	**10.0%**	**15.5%**

Appendix C.6 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	94	50.27	192.44
1	405	White River Junction, VT	91	15.33	83.70
1	518	Bedford, MA	747	33.16	151.53
1	523	Boston, MA	339	22.18	153.20
1	631	Northampton, MA	239	29.93	137.77
1	650	Providence, RI	315	26.04	107.97
1	689	West Haven, CT	420	10.71	98.09
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	1,970	15.44	83.78
3	526	Bronx, NY	414	18.51	82.57
3	561	E. Orange, NY	684	26.45	114.91
3	620	Montrose, NY	269	63.05	118.78
3	630	New York, NY	403	32.69	97.79
3	632	Northport, NY	513	62.47	152.84
4	529	Butler, PA	131	18.26	78.02
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	3	1.33	0.67
4	542	Coatesville, PA	235	29.97	74.48
4	595	Lebanon, PA	175	63.42	106.87
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	409	44.15	96.98
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	103	10.43	83.22
5	512	Baltimore, MD	694	40.97	109.33
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	391	9.96	74.30
5	688	Washington DC	386	28.82	89.22
6	558	Durham, NC	159	40.77	73.11
6	590	Hampton, VA	440	44.80	94.22
6	652	Richmond, VA	105	14.48	84.94
6	658	Salem, VA	167	65.56	125.41
6	659	Salisbury, NC	94	22.02	80.72
7	508	Atlanta, GA	371	23.45	81.94
7	509	Augusta, GA	461	28.23	111.04
7	521	Birmingham, AL	89	7.67	155.26
7	534	Charleston, SC	122	5.52	99.67
7	544	Columbia, SC	451	10.39	57.54
7	557	Dublin, GA	215	12.98	63.41
7	619	Montgomery, AL	450	17.78	96.22
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	468	20.34	73.25
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	411	20.77	85.75
8	546	Miami, FL	296	17.18	90.74
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	275	22.64	46.45
8	573	Gainesville, FL	628	13.46	81.44
8	673	Tampa, FL	951	11.40	35.65
9	596	Lexington, KY	6	18.83	31.17
9	614	Memphis, TN	412	11.35	34.84
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	535	6.76	84.57
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	180	7.52	72.96

Appendix C.6 cont. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	988	23.75	76.21
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	400	26.08	75.13
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,974	25.25	80.98
10	552	Dayton, OH	585	38.4	97.2
10	757	Columbus, OH	95	6.3	60.8
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	145	16.3	99.1
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	680	25.03	63.61
11	550	Danville, IL	190	49.17	104.12
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	334	35.92	86.46
11	610	Marion, IL	280	3.67	42.84
12	556	North Chicago, IL	511	44.90	106.40
12	578	Hines, IL	784	50.97	98.75
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	10	4.30	8.40
12	607	Madison, WI	191	26.90	91.86
12	676	Tomah, WI	256	82.28	179.48
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	299	108.11	189.74
15	589	Kansas City, MO	1,423	33.56	98.29
15	657	St. Louis, MO	203	18.35	45.21
16	502	Alexandria, LA	269	6.77	59.83
16	520	Biloxi, MS	350	42.52	103.73
16	580	Houston, TX	683	46.02	109.14
16	586	Jackson, MS	222	8.41	68.12
16	598	Little Rock, AR	1,204	23.46	73.92
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	119	10.73	75.00
16	667	Shreveport, LA	238	36.08	84.54
17	549	Dallas, TX	1,266	32.64	106.57
17	671	San Antonio, TX	351	12.84	66.66
17	674	Temple, TX	463	8.00	68.16
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	526	35.02	106.41
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	545	2.21	22.97
18	649	Prescott, AZ	558	9.33	80.96
18	678	Tucson, AZ	167	47.25	96.92
18	756	El Paso, TX	11	41.36	101.09
19	554	Denver, Co	307	2.19	28.24
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	308	23.90	74.46
19	666	Sheridan, WY	7	1.29	10.43
20	463	Anchorage, AK	85	12.42	79.71
20	531	Boise, ID	4	6.25	91.00
20	648	Portland, OR	545	20.76	61.93
20	653	Roseburg, OR	124	20.09	105.58
20	663	Seattle, WA	415	6.97	79.65
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	92	30.33	76.45
20	692	White City, OR	97	47.26	71.61
21	459	Honolulu, HI	86	58.15	120.50
21	612	Martinez, CA	204	2.25	13.45
21	640	Palo Alto	169	13.85	103.76
21	654	Reno, NV	99	52.72	124.42
21	662	San Francisco, CA	243	15.36	84.05

Appendix C.6 cont. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	89	10.56	75.74
22	600	Long Beach, CA	970	19.95	92.30
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	288	27.03	122.58
22	664	San Diego, CA	138	9.59	109.05
22	691	West LA, CA	589	50.24	122.00
23	437	Fargo, ND	23	60.74	119.83
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	763	35.87	98.95
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	124	2.80	21.96
23	636	Des Moines, IA	529	34.45	85.49
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	775	42.22	101.65
All VA			39,704	27.17	89.57
Site Avg			389	26.34	87.77
Site SD			359	19.23	35.00

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 573 group IT, 535 individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance, 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT, 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.7 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	15	1.40	9.00
1	405	White River Junction, VT	91	15.30	109.44
1	518	Bedford, MA	717	26.80	184.77
1	523	Boston, MA	202	28.02	186.50
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	34.85	149.93
1	650	Providence, RI	277	17.53	171.37
1	689	West Haven, CT	98	5.39	81.65
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	995	20.12	109.38
3	526	Bronx, NY	414	16.79	133.92
3	561	E. Orange, NY	399	15.01	128.63
3	620	Montrose, NY	215	43.19	123.18
3	630	New York, NY	403	31.79	158.29
3	632	Northport, NY	306	65.39	163.47
4	529	Butler, PA	26	45.77	82.08
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	0		
4	542	Coatesville, PA	184	14.91	88.00
4	595	Lebanon, PA	147	40.13	112.30
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	268	44.20	94.92
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	33	17.73	267.21
5	512	Baltimore, MD	274	37.36	99.75
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	241	12.88	85.45
5	688	Washington DC	236	42.30	151.27
6	558	Durham, NC	0		
6	590	Hampton, VA	205	37.78	109.58
6	652	Richmond, VA	34	14.56	96.12
6	658	Salem, VA	101	59.04	118.77
6	659	Salisbury, NC	2	64.50	240.00
7	508	Atlanta, GA	347	20.54	111.06
7	509	Augusta, GA	280	12.03	115.98
7	521	Birmingham, AL	89	7.65	181.82
7	534	Charleston, SC	117	4.28	126.32
7	544	Columbia, SC	305	12.22	91.20
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	16.94	76.17
7	619	Montgomery, AL	432	12.62	118.57
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	289	11.78	86.80
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	187	21.57	140.76
8	546	Miami, FL	190	14.62	132.05
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	79	68.11	95.65
8	573	Gainesville, FL	74	15.46	185.82
8	673	Tampa, FL	150	45.19	85.99
9	596	Lexington, KY	6	18.83	37.40
9	614	Memphis, TN	84	39.67	101.45
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	135	8.80	124.99
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	177	3.33	127.16

Appendix C.7 cont.CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	915	19.29	90.03
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	348	28.97	98.47
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,570	25.50	119.35
10	552	Dayton, OH	118	31.7	112.8
10	757	Columbus, OH	81	5.7	81.8
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	53	13.0	61.6
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	658	9.74	61.08
11	550	Danville, IL	70	80.57	153.88
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	88	63.18	130.49
11	610	Marion, IL	107	4.57	179.93
12	556	North Chicago, IL	394	38.08	109.89
12	578	Hines, IL	453	76.88	126.97
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	10	4.30	9.33
12	607	Madison, WI	110	40.76	165.65
12	676	Tomah, WI	128	65.08	154.86
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	145	92.09	207.92
15	589	Kansas City, MO	645	20.56	125.33
15	657	St. Louis, MO	21	41.71	131.81
16	502	Alexandria, LA	2	26.00	61.00
16	520	Biloxi, MS	203	33.02	68.58
16	580	Houston, TX	285	54.79	135.47
16	586	Jackson, MS	222	8.25	110.11
16	598	Little Rock, AR	165	53.32	97.12
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	51	15.67	41.68
16	667	Shreveport, LA	37	16.30	250.64
17	549	Dallas, TX	1,222	33.25	127.13
17	671	San Antonio, TX	52	20.88	122.16
17	674	Temple, TX	71	3.38	19.29
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	379	36.72	160.88
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	131	3.51	50.18
18	649	Prescott, AZ	508	6.85	91.93
18	678	Tucson, AZ	155	50.46	123.29
18	756	El Paso, TX	11	41.36	123.56
19	554	Denver, Co	305	2.02	62.37
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	60	74.05	150.22
19	666	Sheridan, WY	7	1.29	36.50
20	463	Anchorage, AK	67	13.97	133.14
20	531	Boise, ID	4	6.25	121.33
20	648	Portland, OR	147	46.25	89.24
20	653	Roseburg, OR	42	33.86	141.15
20	663	Seattle, WA	113	9.18	67.16
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	33	22.39	119.88
20	692	White City, OR	32	41.63	96.46
21	459	Honolulu, HI	41	85.22	173.31
21	612	Martinez, CA	204	2.25	58.38
21	640	Palo Alto	153	15.13	148.20
21	654	Reno, NV	66	58.62	171.04
21	662	San Francisco, CA	214	16.83	141.54

Appendix C.7 cont.CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	89	10.46	89.88
22	600	Long Beach, CA	516	10.11	97.90
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	280	26.02	137.04
22	664	San Diego, CA	41	9.56	157.18
22	691	West LA, CA	491	51.55	174.77
23	437	Fargo, ND	23	60.74	131.24
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	751	22.24	109.47
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	37	5.92	40.41
23	636	Des Moines, IA	145	60.40	120.37
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	563	42.59	97.33
All VA			**22,865**	**27.45**	**119.97**
Site Avg			**227**	**29.09**	**116.66**
Site SD			**265**	**21.65**	**47.38**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 - individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation and 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT.

Appendix C.8 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	30	76.20	212.81
1	405	White River Junction, VT	1	1.00	
1	518	Bedford, MA	42	130.69	297.46
1	523	Boston, MA	143	12.71	216.97
1	631	Northampton, MA	30	13.93	212.26
1	650	Providence, RI	114	27.94	150.86
1	689	West Haven, CT	54	9.69	115.28
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	801	2.08	133.76
3	526	Bronx, NY	48	12.83	53.67
3	561	E. Orange, NY	64	72.81	218.68
3	620	Montrose, NY	159	28.90	67.83
3	630	New York, NY	14	8.71	36.71
3	632	Northport, NY	151	71.91	174.60
4	529	Butler, PA	15	13.13	22.00
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	0		
4	542	Coatesville, PA	42	94.98	216.36
4	595	Lebanon, PA	96	27.09	44.47
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	161	31.25	89.92
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	2	3.00	7.00
5	512	Baltimore, MD	261	55.50	147.82
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	167	2.52	87.24
5	688	Washington DC	23	2.78	56.57
6	558	Durham, NC	49	128.96	228.62
6	590	Hampton, VA	227	22.77	81.57
6	652	Richmond, VA	3	3.00	13.00
6	658	Salem, VA	67	74.21	192.47
6	659	Salisbury, NC	61	29.61	141.98
7	508	Atlanta, GA	0		
7	509	Augusta, GA	295	32.60	160.42
7	521	Birmingham, AL	0		
7	534	Charleston, SC	0		
7	544	Columbia, SC	0		
7	557	Dublin, GA	71	17.72	31.97
7	619	Montgomery, AL	1	1.00	
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	59	81.20	237.89
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	71	38.14	59.27
8	546	Miami, FL	126	12.17	150.48
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	0		
8	573	Gainesville, FL	0		
8	673	Tampa, FL	29	86.48	217.89
9	596	Lexington, KY	0		
9	614	Memphis, TN	18	26.61	100.81
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	496	4.86	81.47
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	5	147.20	234.40

Appendix C.8 cont. Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	91	48.82	187.93
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	51	1.82	80.00
10	541	Cleveland, OH	356	15.78	90.91
10	552	Dayton, OH	537	34.5	109.5
10	757	Columbus, OH	3	4.0	15.0
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	2	1.0	
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	95	109.58	232.71
11	550	Danville, IL	87	28.25	70.72
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	92	49.92	88.30
11	610	Marion, IL	11	1.00	
12	556	North Chicago, IL	407	17.40	100.87
12	578	Hines, IL	17	19.12	74.75
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	0		
12	607	Madison, WI	0		
12	676	Tomah, WI	81	84.68	193.70
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	138	130.15	220.71
15	589	Kansas City, MO	553	58.79	113.97
15	657	St. Louis, MO	120	22.98	47.54
16	502	Alexandria, LA	58	20.98	39.64
16	520	Biloxi, MS	72	72.18	170.90
16	580	Houston, TX	414	20.95	81.73
16	586	Jackson, MS	1	14.00	29.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	437	20.55	82.03
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	2	9.00	33.50
16	667	Shreveport, LA	101	51.17	91.07
17	549	Dallas, TX	4	14.75	41.00
17	671	San Antonio, TX	135	10.19	75.24
17	674	Temple, TX	42	2.24	124.17
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	132	25.95	130.75
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	7	2.43	35.33
18	649	Prescott, AZ	111	3.84	61.28
18	678	Tucson, AZ	3	6.00	23.50
18	756	El Paso, TX	0		
19	554	Denver, Co	4	5.75	13.50
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	54	34.93	72.92
19	666	Sheridan, WY	0		
20	463	Anchorage, AK	24	5.00	28.73
20	531	Boise, ID	0		
20	648	Portland, OR	42	45.79	84.66
20	653	Roseburg, OR	14	10.00	44.57
20	663	Seattle, WA	179	6.20	151.78
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	0		
20	692	White City, OR	2	17.00	25.50
21	459	Honolulu, HI	25	56.24	158.57
21	612	Martinez, CA	0		
21	640	Palo Alto	17	1.41	19.86
21	654	Reno, NV	39	33.03	140.94
21	662	San Francisco, CA	0		

Appendix C.8 cont. Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	3	2.00	15.33
22	600	Long Beach, CA	126	14.08	70.73
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	2	9.50	70.00
22	664	San Diego, CA	73	11.99	124.85
22	691	West LA, CA	50	81.42	247.00
23	437	Fargo, ND	0		
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	180	58.08	98.81
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	96	1.13	161.33
23	636	Des Moines, IA	82	84.77	168.67
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	150	44.19	139.57
All VA			**9,318**	**31.61**	**117.36**
Site Avg			**90**	**32.26**	**109.24**
Site SD			**135**	**33.23**	**70.81**

† Includes stop code 573 - group IT and 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT.

Appendix C.9 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	59	40.98	250.78
1	405	White River Junction, VT	1	2.00	1.00
1	518	Bedford, MA	34	1.91	132.13
1	523	Boston, MA	28	1.43	77.80
1	631	Northampton, MA	189	3.38	91.20
1	650	Providence, RI	44	3.66	60.25
1	689	West Haven, CT	375	9.20	112.47
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	1,651	5.29	97.51
3	526	Bronx, NY	10	9.90	71.33
3	561	E. Orange, NY	555	13.41	78.51
3	620	Montrose, NY	164	18.78	97.99
3	630	New York, NY	24	10.08	77.43
3	632	Northport, NY	259	4.55	105.90
4	529	Butler, PA	131	7.67	72.73
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	3	1.33	2.00
4	542	Coatesville, PA	103	3.01	58.82
4	595	Lebanon, PA	138	18.83	112.96
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	173	6.83	45.53
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	74	6.53	53.14
5	512	Baltimore, MD	636	5.83	105.87
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	93	3.95	62.13
5	688	Washington DC	340	3.17	143.80
6	558	Durham, NC	118	1.38	92.67
6	590	Hampton, VA	384	17.70	95.61
6	652	Richmond, VA	105	9.68	129.85
6	658	Salem, VA	12	1.08	1.00
6	659	Salisbury, NC	41	3.29	57.07
7	508	Atlanta, GA	248	6.34	108.16
7	509	Augusta, GA	4	7.00	78.00
7	521	Birmingham, AL	1	2.00	9.00
7	534	Charleston, SC	78	2.22	68.77
7	544	Columbia, SC	349	2.74	34.67
7	557	Dublin, GA	210	4.55	76.22
7	619	Montgomery, AL	326	7.81	111.16
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	362	3.66	72.61
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	370	4.85	99.63
8	546	Miami, FL	57	13.58	107.98
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	269	3.14	76.46
8	573	Gainesville, FL	601	12.16	130.07
8	673	Tampa, FL	875	1.78	45.47
9	596	Lexington, KY	0		
9	614	Memphis, TN	373	2.32	90.87
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	4	3.50	26.33
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	3	9.67	55.50

Appendix C.9 cont. Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	251	5.47	87.42
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	166	1.54	75.98
10	541	Cleveland, OH	865	4.85	79.33
10	552	Dayton, OH	51	3.2	24.2
10	757	Columbus, OH	43	3.0	34.0
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	136	12.3	126.9
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	67	3.01	100.39
11	550	Danville, IL	186	6.69	126.36
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	329	5.60	94.80
11	610	Marion, IL	165	3.20	68.06
12	556	North Chicago, IL	303	2.83	52.68
12	578	Hines, IL	705	6.82	100.51
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	0		
12	607	Madison, WI	124	5.27	61.15
12	676	Tomah, WI	118	49.79	201.71
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	205	4.93	161.59
15	589	Kansas City, MO	731	2.70	62.86
15	657	St. Louis, MO	75	1.23	54.64
16	502	Alexandria, LA	238	2.32	135.83
16	520	Biloxi, MS	338	8.82	95.13
16	580	Houston, TX	634	11.26	124.01
16	586	Jackson, MS	3	7.00	104.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	987	10.61	72.46
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	107	4.30	103.92
16	667	Shreveport, LA	207	13.60	94.81
17	549	Dallas, TX	282	2.22	41.90
17	671	San Antonio, TX	323	6.33	102.21
17	674	Temple, TX	417	8.09	79.60
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	333	3.24	114.51
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	459	1.58	60.33
18	649	Prescott, AZ	362	3.59	78.98
18	678	Tucson, AZ	18	2.89	14.25
18	756	El Paso, TX	0		
19	554	Denver, Co	2	15.50	24.50
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	300	3.44	110.33
19	666	Sheridan, WY	0		
20	463	Anchorage, AK	0		
20	531	Boise, ID	0		
20	648	Portland, OR	517	5.01	92.37
20	653	Roseburg, OR	113	8.22	114.86
20	663	Seattle, WA	255	2.93	76.57
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	72	28.49	121.20
20	692	White City, OR	75	42.91	103.68
21	459	Honolulu, HI	62	1.63	62.00
21	612	Martinez, CA	0		
21	640	Palo Alto	2	1.00	
21	654	Reno, NV	45	1.38	71.27
21	662	San Francisco, CA	81	1.62	57.94

Appendix C.9 cont. Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	3	1.00	
22	600	Long Beach, CA	827	14.95	109.66
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	146	3.28	132.79
22	664	San Diego, CA	57	1.00	
22	691	West LA, CA	146	1.45	70.38
23	437	Fargo, ND	0		
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	15	13.80	36.93
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	5	4.00	60.00
23	636	Des Moines, IA	417	6.03	66.48
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	610	3.46	97.46
All VA			**22,852**	**6.85**	**92.57**
Site Avg			**232**	**7.28**	**85.18**
Site SD			**270**	**8.51**	**40.18**

† Includes stop codes 535 - individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.10 Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Teatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
1	402	Togus, ME	94	13.8%	28.7%	58.5%
1	405	White River Junction, VT	91	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	747	94.8%	4.8%	1.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	339	56.6%	39.2%	4.7%
1	631	Northampton, MA	239	48.5%	9.2%	44.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	315	72.4%	23.2%	8.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	420	6.4%	7.1%	86.7%
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	1,970	40.4%	7.2%	54.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	414	96.6%	3.4%	0.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NY	684	32.5%	6.4%	64.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	269	45.7%	21.2%	40.5%
3	630	New York, NY	403	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	513	45.6%	22.2%	32.9%
4	529	Butler, PA	131	0.0%	0.8%	99.2%
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	3	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	235	62.6%	11.9%	29.4%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	175	37.1%	30.3%	62.3%
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	409	40.3%	20.0%	40.1%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	103	31.1%	0.0%	68.9%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	694	10.7%	15.7%	75.2%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	391	57.3%	35.5%	7.7%
5	688	Washington DC	386	51.0%	1.6%	52.3%
6	558	Durham, NC	159	0.0%	28.9%	71.1%
6	590	Hampton, VA	440	16.6%	31.1%	60.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	105	2.9%	0.0%	97.1%
6	658	Salem, VA	167	58.7%	35.9%	5.4%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	94	1.1%	64.9%	34.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	371	80.9%	0.0%	22.1%
7	509	Augusta, GA	461	47.7%	52.3%	0.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	89	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	122	91.8%	0.0%	8.2%
7	544	Columbia, SC	451	59.9%	0.0%	53.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	215	4.7%	15.8%	82.3%
7	619	Montgomery, AL	450	80.0%	0.0%	22.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	468	39.3%	7.9%	53.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	411	27.0%	11.2%	65.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	296	57.1%	35.1%	12.8%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	275	6.5%	0.0%	93.8%
8	573	Gainesville, FL	628	7.2%	0.0%	93.2%
8	673	Tampa, FL	951	8.2%	2.3%	89.5%
9	596	Lexington, KY	6	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	412	12.9%	1.0%	86.7%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	535	9.9%	90.7%	0.0%
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	180	98.3%	1.7%	0.0%

Appendix C.10 cont. Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Teatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	988	88.7%	3.2%	9.1%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	400	81.5%	3.3%	17.3%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,974	77.4%	2.0%	21.9%
10	552	Dayton, OH	585	12.3%	84.3%	4.3%
10	757	Columbus, OH	95	74.7%	0.0%	25.3%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	145	21.4%	0.0%	80.7%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	680	89.4%	9.4%	2.5%
11	550	Danville, IL	190	11.6%	9.5%	85.8%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	334	11.7%	10.5%	79.0%
11	610	Marion, IL	280	38.2%	2.9%	58.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	511	40.5%	65.2%	33.1%
12	578	Hines, IL	784	44.4%	0.0%	59.4%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	10	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	191	42.9%	0.0%	58.1%
12	676	Tomah, WI	256	47.7%	21.9%	30.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	299	36.8%	35.8%	31.4%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	1,423	39.4%	23.5%	37.9%
15	657	St. Louis, MO	203	8.9%	56.2%	35.0%
16	502	Alexandria, LA	269	0.0%	18.6%	81.4%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	350	19.7%	10.3%	80.9%
16	580	Houston, TX	683	12.9%	15.2%	73.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	222	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	1,204	4.9%	28.4%	67.6%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	119	26.1%	0.0%	75.6%
16	667	Shreveport, LA	238	13.9%	14.3%	84.5%
17	549	Dallas, TX	1,266	86.3%	0.0%	14.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	351	6.3%	20.8%	81.5%
17	674	Temple, TX	463	8.2%	7.8%	84.2%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	526	58.6%	8.4%	35.0%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	545	21.7%	0.0%	78.7%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	558	66.7%	3.9%	30.5%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	167	92.2%	0.0%	7.8%
18	756	El Paso, TX	11	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
19	554	Denver, Co	307	99.3%	0.7%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	308	6.2%	4.9%	90.3%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	7	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	85	71.8%	28.2%	0.0%
20	531	Boise, ID	4	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	545	9.9%	1.3%	89.4%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	124	21.8%	2.4%	80.6%
20	663	Seattle, WA	415	16.4%	35.7%	48.4%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	92	29.3%	0.0%	73.9%
20	692	White City, OR	97	29.9%	0.0%	70.1%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	86	24.4%	10.5%	67.4%
21	612	Martinez, CA	204	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto	169	90.5%	9.5%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	99	44.4%	24.2%	33.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	243	83.5%	0.0%	16.5%

Appendix C.10 cont. Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Teatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	89	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	970	35.8%	1.9%	70.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	288	93.4%	0.0%	7.6%
22	664	San Diego, CA	138	13.0%	52.2%	34.8%
22	691	West LA, CA	589	74.9%	5.8%	21.7%
23	437	Fargo, ND	23	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	763	94.1%	7.2%	0.5%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	124	22.6%	76.6%	0.8%
23	636	Des Moines, IA	529	14.0%	13.4%	74.3%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	775	47.2%	4.9%	52.8%
All VA			**39,704**	**45.9%**	**13.6%**	**43.0%**
Site Avg			**389**	**47.7%**	**13.7%**	**41.0%**
Site SD			**359**	**34.4%**	**19.5%**	**33.3%**